

Case No. A107100

**COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT, DIVISION FOUR**

CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY
INTERNATIONAL, A California
nonprofit religious corporation,

Plaintiff and Petitioner,

vs.

GERALD ARMSTRONG, and
individual; and DOES 1 THROUGH 50,
inclusive.

Defendants and Respondents.

Appeal Case No. A107100

[Consolidated with Case No. A107095]

ON APPEAL AFTER JUDGMENT ENTERED BY THE HONORABLE LYNN
DURYEE, MARIN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT

APPELLANT'S APPENDIX

VOL. II (Pages 237-399)

ANDREW H. WILSON (SBN 63209)
WILSON CAMPILONGO LLP
475 Gate Five Road, Suite 212
Sausalito, CA 94965-1475
Telephone: (415) 289-7100
Facsimile: (415) 289-7110

Attorney for Plaintiff and Petitioner
**CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY
INTERNATIONAL**

Case No. A107100

**COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT, DIVISION FOUR**

CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY
INTERNATIONAL, A California
nonprofit religious corporation,

Plaintiff and Petitioner,

vs.

GERALD ARMSTRONG, and
individual; and DOES 1 THROUGH 50,
inclusive.

Defendants and Respondents.

Appeal Case No. A107100

[Consolidated with Case No. A107095]

ON APPEAL AFTER JUDGMENT ENTERED BY THE HONORABLE LYNN
DURYEE, MARIN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT

APPELLANT'S APPENDIX

VOL. II (Pages 237-399)

ANDREW H. WILSON (SBN 63209)
WILSON CAMPILONGO LLP
475 Gate Five Road, Suite 212
Sausalito, CA 94965-1475
Telephone: (415) 289-7100
Facsimile: (415) 289-7110

Attorney for Plaintiff and Petitioner
**CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY
INTERNATIONAL**

APPELLANT'S APPENDIX

VOLUME 1

	<u>PAGE</u>
1. Complaint files in <i>Church of Scientology International v. Armstrong</i> , Case No. 152229.....	1-3
2. Complaint filed in <i>Church of Scientology International v. Armstrong</i> , Case No. 157680.....	14-29
3. Complaint filed in <i>Church of Scientology International v. Armstrong</i> , Case No. CV021632.....	30-39
Exh. A: Release of All Claims and Settlement Agreement.....	40-59
Exh. B: Order of Contempt re: Case No. 152229, 6/5/97 and Second Order of Contempt re: Case Nos. 152229 & 157680, 2/20/98.....	60-68
Exh. C: Civil Bench Warrants re: Case No. 152229.....	69-73
Exh. D: Order of Contempt re: Case No. 152229, dated 7/13/01.....	74-78
Exh. E: Armstrong Breaches of Settlement Agreement (Postings).....	79-95
4. March 1998 posting by Armstrong in response to Roland Rashleigh- Berry. Armstrong describes his alleged experiences when he worked in Public Relations in Scientology in the 1970s.....	96
5. March 5, 1998 posting by Armstrong in which he posts a derogatory affidavit which he had written regarding Scientology that he had submitted to Revenue Canada.....	97
6. May 21, 1998 posting by Armstrong critical of the Church of Scientology...	98
7. May 22, 1998 posting by Armstrong which includes a declaration by Armstrong, filed in another case, in which he discusses his alleged background in Scientology and makes various accusations against the Church.....	99-110
8. July 16, 1998 posting by Armstrong critical of the Church and Church executives... ..	111
9. August 27, 1998 posting by Armstrong critical of Mr. Hubbard and his schooling.....	112-113

10. September 5, 1998 posting by Armstrong regarding the dismissal of his lawsuit against CSI in Nevada, his status as a fugitive from justice, and his criticism of the California justice system.	114
11. September 24, 1998 posting by Armstrong regarding Grady Ward, a copyright infringer against the Church, where Armstrong wants to meet Ward and discuss their litigation and have Ward testify against the Church in Armstrong's opposition to a finding of his contempt of court.	115
12. September 25, 1998 posting by Armstrong offering to be an expert witness for Grady Ward in the suit brought against Ward for violating copyrights of Scientology materials.	116
13. September 30, 1998 posting by Armstrong critical of Scientology spiritual practices..	117
14. November 17, 1998 posting by Armstrong of his declaration claiming that the Church caused him to be detained by police in San Anselmo, California.....	118-119
15. November 27, 1998 posting by Armstrong where he claims that no one who has communicated with him has been sued or will be sued pursuant to the injunction against him. Armstrong admits that he has communicated with other media entities and individuals about Scientology and his experiences.....	120-121
16. December 24, 1998 posting by Armstrong where he talks about setting up a national level debate or hearing about Scientology.....	122
17. December 24, 1998 posting by Armstrong suggesting that a compilation of letters critical of the Church be given out at future protests or to the media.....	123
18. January 8, 1999 posting by Armstrong in response to posting by Ralph Hilton, another former Scientologist whom Armstrong allegedly knew, discussing Armstrong's recollection of events from his days in the Church.....	124-125

19. January 12, 1999 posting by Armstrong in which he comments on past postings he made about Scientologists.	126-127
20. January 12, 1999 posting by Armstrong responding to Rick Larsen, concerning a personality test used in Scientology churches.	128
21. January 12, 1999 posting by Armstrong about a fire that occurred when Armstrong was in one church in Clearwater, Florida.	129
22. January 12, 1999 posting by Armstrong responding to "John D.", saying he is writing a book critical of Scientology, and criticizing the Permanent Injunction.....	130-132
23. January 16, 1999 posting by Armstrong critical of Scientologists making donations for religious service.	133
24. January 18, 1999: posting by Armstrong, as a continuation of the previous posting, comparing Scientology and Christianity.	134
25. February 22, 1999 posting by Armstrong discussing ARS and how it is a hot bed of anti-Scientology sentiments and it "is bringing the gospel" to Scientologists.....	135
26. February 22, 1999 posting by Armstrong attempting to provoke a "response" from the psychiatric community against the Church.....	136-137
27. March 6, 1999 posting by Armstrong re his experiences with William Broderick who he knew when they were both in Scientology.....	138
28. March 17, 1999 posting by Armstrong responding to Rob Clark, and explaining what one of Armstrong's positions was when he was a Church staff member.....	139
29. March 20, 1999 posting by Armstrong which quotes an attacker of the Church.....	140

	<u>PAGE</u>
30. March 21, 1999 posting by Armstrong with a number of reasons why he claims Scientology won't succeed.	141
31. March 21, 1999 posting by Armstrong where he describes actions he allegedly performed during a project while working on Church staff.	142-143
32. March 22, 1999 Posting by Armstrong where he makes allegations about Vicki Aznaran, a former Scientologist who sued the Church and later settled.....	144
33. March 28,1999 posting by Armstrong re Mr. Hubbard's military service which Armstrong supposedly knew about and which was mentioned in his earlier litigation with the Church.....	145-148
34. March 28, 1999 posting by Armstrong of the Settlement Agreement signed on 3-19-99 in a suit brought by Scientology entities for copyright infringement, including Armstrong's own comments about Scientology and that case.....	149-158
35. April 2, 1999 posting by Armstrong critical of a Church executive.....	159
36. April 3,1999 posting by Armstrong attacking the Church and its news journal, Freedom Magazine.....	160
37. April 3, 1999 posting by Armstrong criticizing certain Scientology practices and writings.....	161
38. April 4, 1999 posting by Armstrong criticizing Mr. Hubbard.....	162
39. April 4, 1999 posting by Armstrong regarding documents he allegedly saw while he was a Church staff member.....	163-164
40. April 7, 1999 posting by Armstrong regarding a web page allegedly put up by Scientologists.....	165

41. April 11, 1999 posting by Armstrong stating that opposition to "Scientology the religion" and distribution of their "sacred scriptures" is protected religious expression and pickets are tax deductible religious contributions.....	166-167
42. April 19, 1999 posting by Armstrong concerning a Church staff member from the early 1980's.....	168-169
43. April 20, 1999 posting by Armstrong containing allegations about Mr. Hubbard.....	170
44. April 20, 1999 posting by Armstrong commenting on a letter from Grady Ward to a Church attorney, including allegations about his own settlement with the Church.....	171-172
45. April 20, 1999 posting by Armstrong ridiculing certain Scientology beliefs.....	173
46. April 20, 1999 posting by Armstrong denigrating Scientology and its leadership.....	174
47. April 22, 1999 posting by Armstrong concerning the alleged handling of PR and legal matters by Church officials.....	175
48. April 27, 1999 posting by Armstrong containing various accusations against Scientologists.	176-177
49. May 1, 1999 posting by Armstrong concerning alleged actions by Scientologists.....	178-179
50. May 2, 1999 posting by Armstrong commenting on the settlement of a suit between Dennis Erlich and Scientology entities.	180
51. May 4, 1999 posting by Armstrong advocating public hearings on Scientology.....	181

PAGE

52. May 8, 1999 posting by Armstrong in which he guesses how much Dennis Erlich received in his settlement with the Church.....	182
53. May 24, 1999 posting by Armstrong responding to Carol Eidge and offering to help remove her children from Scientology.....	183-184
54. May 24, 1999 posting by Armstrong concerning an individual who was allegedly involved in Scientology in the 1950's and 60's.....	185
55. June 3, 1999 posting by Armstrong commenting about the IRS having granted tax exemption to Scientology churches.....	186
56. June 6, 1999 posting by Armstrong about an alleged former Scientologist.....	187-189
57. June 6, 1999 posting by Armstrong giving advice to another Internet poster and offering his own experience in Scientology as an example.....	190-192
58. June 15, 1999 posting by Armstrong giving legal advice to a person in relation to Scientology.....	193-194
59. June 16, 1999 posting by Armstrong suggesting a demonstration at the governor's office in Sacramento against Scientology.....	195-196
60. June 28, 1999 posting by Armstrong in which he makes allegations about Scientology management and suggests various actions to be taken against it.....	197-198
61. June 30, 1999 posting by Armstrong containing various allegations about Scientology.....	199
62. July 1, 1999 posting by Armstrong concerning alleged forgeries by Scientologists on the Internet.....	200
63. July 4, 1999 posting by Armstrong concerning an early Scientologist, whom he interviewed when he was a Church staff member.	201-202

	<u>PAGE</u>
64. July 7, 1999 posting by Armstrong concerning his time in Scientology.....	203-204
65. July 11, 1999 posting by Armstrong offering himself as a percipient and expert witness in a civil suit against a Scientology church.....	205-206
66. July 12, 1999 posting by Armstrong about searching for documents relevant to litigation against the Church.	207
67. July 17, 1999 posting by Armstrong about a "solution to the Scientology problem".....	208-209
68. July 18, 1999 posting by Armstrong about the "sporgeries" on the Internet and various accusations about Scientologists.	210
69. July 20, 1999 posting by Armstrong concerning his experiences on Church staff and Scientologists' beliefs about Mr. Hubbard.	211-212
70. July 20, 1999 posting by Armstrong concerning writings by Mr. Hubbard.....	213-215
71. August 8, 1999 posting by Armstrong concerning apostate Stacy Brooks; suing a senior Scientology church; upper Scientology management and the corporate structure of the Church.....	216-230
72. August 9, 1999 posting by Armstrong containing allegations about how the Church deals with its opponents.	231
73. August 9, 1999 posting by Armstrong about Mr. Hubbard.....	232-233
74. August 9, 1999 posting by Armstrong commenting on statements by Mr. Hubbard about drugs.	234
75. August 17, 1999 posting by Armstrong in which he reposts a letter by attacker Garry Scarff regarding an attorney who represents him in legal matters concerning the Church.	235-236

APPELLANT'S APPENDIX

VOLUME II

76. August 17, 1999 posting by Armstrong concerning Mr. Hubbard and quoting from Scientology scripture.....	237-238
77. August 17, 1999 posting by Armstrong about some of his alleged experiences in the Church.....	239-243
78. August 17, 1999 posting by Armstrong about a declaration he wrote concerning Scientology.....	244-245
79. August 18, 1999 posting by Armstrong promoting books critical about Scientology.....	246-250
80. September 10, 1999 posting by Armstrong commenting on postings about others' alleged experiences in Scientology.....	251-252
81. September 12, 1999 posting by Armstrong about posters who are critical of Scientology.....	253-254
82. September 16, 1999 posting by Armstrong concerning an essay contest sponsored by Robert Minton for critics of Scientology and whether Armstrong should participate.....	255-266
83. September 28, 1999 posting by Armstrong criticizing Mr. Hubbard and Scientology scripture.....	267-269
84. September 28, 1999 posting by Armstrong criticizing Scientologists.....	270-271
85. September 29, 1999 posting by Armstrong urging Scientologists to get out of Scientology.....	272-275
86. September 30, 1999 posting by Armstrong asserting that Scientology is not spiritual.....	276-277

PAGE

87. October 1, 1999 posting by Armstrong saying he does many things to get Scientologists to leave Scientology.....	278-279
88. October 1, 1999 posting by Armstrong about Scientologists' ethics.....	280-281
89. October 1, 1999 posting by Armstrong criticizing a senior Scientologist.....	282
90. October 2, 1999 posting by Armstrong concerning folders used in connection with Scientology counseling.....	283
91. October 2, 1999 posting by Armstrong alleging he has documentation concerning use of Scientology counseling folders.....	284-286
92. October 2, 1998 posting by Armstrong concerning the Scientology church in Belgium.....	287-289
93. October 2, 1999 posting by Armstrong about getting anti-Scientology literature passed around.....	290
94. October 2, 1999 posting by Armstrong in which he responds to derogatory statements of another regarding Scientology practices.....	291-295
95. October 7, 1999 posting by Armstrong making contemptuous statements about Scientology organizations.	296
96. October 7, 1999 posting by Armstrong about Scientology scriptures being posted on the Internet.....	297-298
97. October 7, 1999 posting by Armstrong about hate sites on the Internet and attempting to get a Scientologist to leave the Church.....	299-303
98. October 9, 1999 posting by Armstrong about people who he believes work for the Church.....	304-305
99. October 9, 1999 posting by Armstrong in which he posts a news release announcing the judgment entered against him in Marin County for breaching the settlement agreement with the Church, along with his comments on this.....	306-311

PAGE

100. October 12, 1999 posting by Armstrong about asking questions to a new Scientology web site.....	312
101. October 12, 1999 posting by Armstrong offering to send someone a write up on what he had read in Mr. Hubbard's unpublished book "Excalibur.".....	313
102. November 1, 1999 posting by Armstrong responding to Bob Minton's description of his arrest in Clearwater, Florida on charges of committing battery against a Scientologist.....	314-315
103. November 2, 1999 posting by Armstrong attempting to blame Scientologists for Minton being arrested.....	316-317
104. November 6, 1999 posting by Armstrong about the Church's alleged attempts to deal with critics.....	318
105. November 29, 1999 posting by Armstrong saying that the Church and its leaders are unfair.....	319
106. December 1, 1999 posting by Armstrong regarding a news reporter who has written about the Church in the past.....	320-321
107. December 9, 1999 posting by Armstrong talking about the picketing he recently participated in Clearwater, and the speeches delivered by Church antagonists.....	322-324
108. December 25, 1999 posting by Armstrong in which he defends Bob Minton and makes derogatory statements about Scientology beliefs.....	325-326
109. December 30, 1999 posting by Armstrong in which he answers questions about a person he knew in Scientology in the 70s.....	327-328
110. December 30, 1999 posting by Armstrong in which he posts a portion of the Congressional Record containing requests for the US to resolve the religious discrimination in Germany. Armstrong enters his own negative comments about Scientology.....	329-337

111. December 31, 1999 posting by Armstrong speaking derogatorily about Scientology and saying that the Scientology organizations and technology should be dismantled.	338-340
112. December 31, 1999 posting by Armstrong in which he claims he is an expert in the subject of Scientology.....	341-347
113. January 3, 2000 posting by Armstrong recounting alleged incidents from he was a Church staff member.....	348-349
114. January 3, 2000 posting by Armstrong regarding mental illness and Scientology.....	350
115. January 3 2000 posting by Armstrong agreeing with another poster's criticisms of the Church.	351-353
116. January 3, 2000 posting by Armstrong in which he makes comments regarding another poster's version of what occurred within the Church after Mr. Hubbard's death.....	354-356
117. January 4, 2000 posting by Armstrong stating that he would never embrace destroying Scientology as it is an impossibility and commenting on what he believes are the goals of Scientology.....	357-358
118. January 5, 2000 posting by Armstrong continuing derogatory comments about Scientology.....	359
119. January 5, 2000 posting by Armstrong about psychiatrists and the handling of psychotic people, including accusations regarding Scientology practices.....	360-362
120. January 6, 2000 posting by Armstrong in which he discusses "stalking" and that he kept a big sign in his storefront window "Is Scientology Stalking You?".....	363-364
121. January 6, 2000 posting by Armstrong referencing Lisa McPherson Trust and how Scientology is trying to destroy it.....	365

122. January 16, 2000 posting by Armstrong in which he re-posts the mission statement for the "Lisa McPherson Trust," and affirms his agreement with this anti-Scientology statement.....	366-371
123. January 19, 2000 posting by Armstrong responding to a posting by Rod Keller regarding the Church's facility in Clearwater, Florida.....	372-373
124. January 19, 2000 posting by Armstrong in which he states that "Freedom of religion includes the freedom to condemn all of Scientology."	374
125. January 24, 2000 posting by Armstrong regarding an affidavit filed in a suit against the Church.	375-376
126. January 29, 2000 posting by Armstrong containing derogatory statements and accusations about the Church.....	377-378
127. January 29, 2000 posting by Armstrong claiming that he used to be a liar when he was a Scientologist.....	379
128. January 30, 2000 posting by Armstrong in which he discusses serving a lawsuit on a senior Church executive.....	380-381
129. February 19, 2000 posting by Armstrong talking about a position he held when he was a Church staff member.....	382-386
130. March 20, 2000 posting by Armstrong to Keith Henson about his legal case with the Church and how Armstrong was prevented from testifying for Henson. He says he believes "that Judge Whyte is crooked in some way" and "should have found a way to bar Scientology from his courtroom."	387-391
131. April 16, 2000 posting by Armstrong about going to protest at a Scientology event.....	392

PAGE

132. May 4, 2000 posting by Armstrong continuing various accusations about the Church.....	393-394
133. July 10, 2000 posting by Armstrong in response to another about his settlement agreement which he calls a "gag 'contract'"	395
134. July 11, 2000 posting by Armstrong in response to another in which he makes derogatory allegations about Scientologists.....	396-399

=====
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology

Subject: Re: Chanting - was Re: "Bowfinger" review at Nando Times web site

From: armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong)

Date: Tue, 17 Aug 1999 17:05:39 GMT

On 13 Aug 1999 11:26:44 -0700, Warrior <werreour@flash.net> wrote:

>Yeti wrote:

>>

>> Huh? The other reviewer indicated that the New Ageish (very different from
>> Scientology) MindHead organization has a *chanting* going on in its *temple*
>> (or whatever) - "Welcome to MindHead". Chanting religions and Scientology
>> have zilch to do with each other.

>

>You obviously don't know much about Scientology. Chanting *does* happen
>in Scientology. It's just called "Chinese school", and it used to be
>done daily by the entire staff when I was in the Sea Org.

He was never on the Flagship "Apollo" either.

Hubbard had crew members chanting "The planet is ours. We're moving
in. The planet is ours. We're moving in. The planet is ours. We're
moving in. The planet is ours. We're moving in. The planet is ours.
We're moving in. We're moving in. We're moving in. We're moving
in."

This went on for hours and days. This chant made it onto one of
Hubbard's hit records, I believe.

This might now make a good chant for protests.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

>See HCO PL 9 March 1972 Issue III. "Chinese school" is defined as

>

> "staff or divisional staff all together in front of a big

> org board chanting together..."

>

000237

>HCO PL of 13 May 1972 says in part:

>

> "There are two steps in such teaching [Chinese school]. (a) The
> instructor taps [with a pointer] and says what it is, then asks
> the class what it is and they chant the answer; (b) when the
> class has learned by being told and repeating, the instructor
> now taps with the pointer and asks and the class chants the
> correct answer."

>

>LRH ED 53 International gives this definition:

>

> "to teach staffs by repetition and demonstration."

>

>The concept is also explained by Hubbard with his statement,

>

> "Number of times over the materials equals certainty."

>

>Regarding "Chinese schooling", Hubbard said it

>

> "...is an action of class vocal participation. It is a
> very loud, lively affair. It sounds like chanting. It is
> essentially a system that establishes instant thought
> responses".

>

>"Chinese schooling" is one of the methods used to indoctrinate
>staff into Hubbard's dogma.

>

>Warrior

>

=====
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology
Subject: Re: Chanting
From: armstrong@dowco.com (germy armstrong)
Date: Tue, 17 Aug 1999 21:40:28 GMT

On 17 Aug 1999 11:15:36 -0700, Warrior <werreour@flash.net> wrote:

>>>> Yeti wrote:

>>>>

>>>> Huh? The other reviewer indicated that the New Ageish (very different from
>>>> Scientology) MindHead organization has a *chanting* going on in its *temple*
>>>> (or whatever) - "Welcome to MindHead". Chanting religions and Scientology
>>>> have zilch to do with each other.

>

>> On 13 Aug 1999 11:26:44 -0700, Warrior <werreour@flash.net> wrote:

>>>

>>>> You obviously don't know much about Scientology. Chanting *does* happen
>>>> in Scientology. It's just called "Chinese school", and it used to be
>>>> done daily by the entire staff when I was in the Sea Org.

>

> In article <37b9965d.47554284@news.dowco.com>, armstrong@dowco.com says...

>>

>> He [Yeti] was never on the Flagship "Apollo" either.

>>

>> Hubbard had crew members chanting "The planet is ours. We're moving
>> in. The planet is ours. We're moving in. The planet is ours. We're
>> moving in. The planet is ours. We're moving in. The planet is ours.
>> We're moving in. We're moving in. We're moving in. We're moving
>> in."

>

> At ASHO we used to chant: "We are going *up* while the world is
> going down! We are going *up* while the world is going down!
> We are going *up* while the world is going down! We are going *up*
> while the world is going down! We are going *up* while the world is
> going down! We are going *up* while the world is going down! We are
> going *up* while the world is going down! We are going *up* while the
> world is going down!"

>

> Another one that we chanted during "Chinese School" was:

>
>"Recognition, communication, perception, orientation, understanding,
>enlightenment, energy, adjustment, body, prediction, activity,
>production, validity, enhancement, correction, purposes, realization,
>clearing, conditions, existence, SOURCE!"
>
>Remember *that* one!??
>
>I'll bet most readers of ARS have no idea what that was about, but
>I'll bet anything that you, Gerry, remember and know the "significance"
>of that chant.

Sure, I Chinese Schooled that list. I wonder if, in order to be a little more "politically correct," the cult is squirreling the name of that technique. Maybe to "Hubbard Brainwashing School (TM)." ("The trouble with Scientology is too many \$cienos.") (R)

In the RPF we chanted "The RPF is what we make it. The RPF is where we make it." And then a big yelled thanks for our incarceration to "Commodore, Founder, Source." Did the LA RPF go through that routine every muster as well?

And wasn't "We're going *up* while the world's going down!" also recorded by Hubbard? I can recall the "tune."

>
>It a testimonial to the effectiveness of Hubbard's brainwashing/
>indoctrination methods that I still remember these "awareness
>characteristics" (hint hint...) after all these years; I haven't
>spoken these words for over 20 years, yet they are *programmed*
>forever into my mind.

>
>>This went on for hours and days. This chant made it onto one of
>>Hubbard's hit records, I believe.

>>
>>This might now make a good chant for protests.

>
>Agreed.

>
>>(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

>You're right. I have Hubbard's Apollo Stars "Power of Source" album.

>"We're Moving In" is the first cut on side two of the record, and

>was written by Hubbard and Craig Ferreira (the lead guitar player
>in the band).

>

>This album is probably the crappiest I have ever heard. The songs

>are boring, the music is dull, the recording quality is extremely

>*bad*, and the lyrics are completely uninspiring. If Hubbard had

>let the Stars make their own record without interference for him,

>perhaps there would have been some good music come out of the

>project. If Hubbard were alive, he'd perhaps blame Tony Strawn,

>Bill Broderick, Wayne Marple, Homer Schomer and Russ Meadows

>for being "undetected SPs" on the project.

>

>I only keep the record around for it's trivia value and to remind

>me of what a "dabble life" LRH led. And for the fact that Hubbard's

>picture on the cover shows him to be the true devil he is. I mean,

>he looks downright *evil* on the cover -- really "in valence"!

>

>Names of those involved in the album:

>

>Neil Sarfati - saxophone

>Wayne Marple - trumpet

>Luten Taylor - bass trombone

>Charlie Rush - drums

>Bill Potter - saxophone

>Kenny Campleman - flute

>Tom Rodriguez - bongos

>Craig Ferreira - lead guitar

>Tamia Arbuckle - bass guitar & guitar

>Russ Meadows - flute & bass guitar

>Dan Auerbach - Hubbard's audio-visio [sic] assistant

>Tony Strawn - guest artist on congos

>Laurie Douglas - guest singer

>Bill Broderick - stage & equipment

>Kip Hansen - stage & equipment

>Homer Schomer - stage & equipment

>Claire Mauerer - cover photography

I don't have the album, but I recall Laurel Watson, later Laurel Sullivan, also appearing on the cover photo.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

>==

>[posted/mailed]

>

>Warrior

>

>>Warrior <werreour@flash.net> also wrote:

>>>

>>>See HCO PL 9 March 1972 Issue III. "Chinese school" is defined as

>>>

>>> "staff or divisional staff all together in front of a big

>>> org board chanting together..."

>>>

>>>HCO PL of 13 May 1972 says in part:

>>>

>>> "There are two steps in such teaching [Chinese school]. (a) The

>>> instructor taps [with a pointer] and says what it is, then asks

>>> the class what it is and they chant the answer; (b) when the

>>> class has learned by being told and repeating, the instructor

>>> now taps with the pointer and asks and the class chants the

>>> correct answer."

>>>

>>>LRH ED 53 International gives this definition:

>>>

>>> "to teach staffs by repetition and demonstration."

>>>

>>>The concept is also explained by Hubbard with his statement,

>>>

>>> "Number of times over the materials equals certainty."

>>>

>>>Regarding "Chinese schooling", Hubbard said it

>>>

>>> "...is an action of class vocal participation. It is a

>>> very loud, lively affair. It sounds like chanting. It is

>>> essentially a system that establishes instant thought

Re: Chanting

Page 5

>>> responses".

>>>

>>>"Chinese schooling" is one of the methods used to indoctrinate

>>>staff into Hubbard's dogma.

>>>

>>>Warrior

>

=====
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology

Subject: Re: FBI Special Agents Visit Mr. Lerma's home connected to Massimo Introvgene?

From: armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong)

Date: Tue, 17 Aug 1999 16:58:02 GMT

On 16 Aug 1999 18:44:17 -0700, Arnie Lerma <Arnie_member@newsguy.com> wrote:

>

>

>Just a little visit by a couple

>Special Agents of FBI Terrorism task Force

>They entered Casa De Lerma under the influence

>of what appeared to me

>to be purposely fabricated information

Arnie:

In 1985 an FBI agent came to the Flynn & Joyce law office where I was working in Boston, MA to interview me concerning a report the agency had received that I had impersonated an FBI agent. The FBI say that they cannot divulge who the instigator is, but from the timing, circumstances and the little bit the agent said, I knew it was Scientology which had made the report.

I therefore wrote a declaration concerning Scientology and its history of attacks, including attacks on me, and its policy of destroying targeted "enemies," and sent it to the interviewing agent so that it would appear alongside Scientology's false report in the FBI's files.

Then I filed an FOIA request and received a copy (redacted, of course) of my FBI file.

So I suggest you do the same. And I suggest you run what happened by some lawyers, and have a lawyer check what you file with the FBI.

Almost a year after this effort by Scientology to have me charged by the FBI on their false report I was able to identify the Scientologist

Re: FBI Special Agents Visit Mr. Lerma's home connected to Massimo Intro

Page 2

the cult had used to make the false report, and the cult lawyer who had participated.

Good luck.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

000245

=====
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology

Subject: Re: The Crit Lit's Destruction was: Re: You can

From: armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong)

Date: Wed, 18 Aug 1999 02:20:08 GMT

On Tue, 17 Aug 1999 21:43:22 GMT, martin@islandnet.com (Martin Hunt) wrote:

>welcome@bernie.us-inc.com (Bern - http://welcome.to/ars) wrote:

>

>>On Fri, 13 Aug 1999 02:14:03 GMT mreuss@mciworld.com (Michael Reuss) wrote:

>>

>>>> welcome@bernie.us-inc.com (Bern - http://welcome.to/ars) wrote:

>>>>> mreuss@mciworld.com (Michael Reuss) wrote:

>>>>>> welcome@bernie.us-inc.com (Bern - http://welcome.to/ars) wrote:

>>>>>>> martin@islandnet.com (Martin Hunt) wrote:

>>>

>>>>>Or maybe it's because the library had already bought the critical

>>>>>books and had them in their stacks, but then they were stolen by

>>>>>Scientologists as part of an organized campaign?

>>>

>>>> I doubt they would spend time doing this.

>>>

>>>>I know you'd doubt it, because that's what you do when it comes to

>>>>criticisms of Scientology. And in so doubting, you're simply wrong

>>>>(again). The CoS has organized exactly such theft campaigns from

>>>>libraries in the past. Gerry Armstrong and others have outlined these

>>>>behaviors here on a.r.s several times.

>

>>I know of three separate people who have confessed to doing this

>>for the cult. Amusingly, one of them ran away with his last batch

>>of thefts and left the cult - I am now the proud owner of several

>>of his books.

>

>>I don't doubt that they would do it,

>

>>Good, because they do.

>

>>I doubt they would find it worth spending time on such a futile

>>exercise.

>

>They find it very worthwhile; that's why they do it. It isn't
>"futile" either; they have driven several titles to the brink of
>extinction with their book burning campaigns.

>

>>You think that the reason why there is no such book is because
>>they stole them,

>

>No, in the specific case of the lack of books in the UVIC
>library, I'd say this was very likely merely a case of the
>library never buying these books, however, I will make a point
>of asking them about this issue. For now, the lack of books
>at the UVIC library is merely a matter of speculation, whereas
>the fact the cult does engage in book destruction is not.

>

>>You've got a point there. Guess I don't have much experience at this level :-)
>>Of course, in the Uni library I went two weeks ago, they had electronic gates,
>>but this doesn't mean that there may not be ways to pass things through, or that
>>every Uni library have them or had them at the time.

>

>UVIC has them. However, they are easily defeated; common knowlege:
>a metal detector strip is inserted into the books either between
>the pages or behind the spine. It is easily removed; I'm sure this
>is part of the book burner hat pack.

>

>>Still, it doesn't prove that this is necessarily what they did in this case. Did
>>Martin check if the books *were* registered before and now they are absent
>>without trace of lending?

>

>A couple titles showed up as "missing", something I've seen in
>other libraries during checks on the crit lit. What this means
>is inconclusive; it could just mean that these are popular books
>and people like keeping them, it could be that their rate of
>disappearance is no higher than that of other categories of
>books. However, given the multiple reports of books being stolen
>and destroyed at Scientology's order, this is a likely explanation
>for many of the disappearances.

>

>>That would be some indication. In the absence of

>>anything else, your opinion is just as valid as mine. They both are
>>speculations.

>

>But my speculations are based on the undeniable fact that Scientology
>destroys books and my meeting with a former book burner and
>discussing this issue at length.

>

>Your speculations are based on a vehement dislike of Scientology
>critics.

>

>>Yeah, but Martin did. He compared registered books with unregistered ones.
>>Apples and oranges.

>

>I'm not even sure what you mean by "registered" and "unregistered"
>books.

>

>These are the facts:

>

>1. Scientology has stolen critical books from libraries in BC.
>2. Libraries in BC are lacking in critical books. Notably, Jon
> Atack's book is very scarce in BC libraries. Vosper's book
> and several others are simply not available.

>

>I suggest that critics make a habit of checking library inventories
>in their areas for the following books:

>

>A Piece of Blue Sky - Jon Atack
>Bare-Faced Messiah - Russell Miller
>The Road to Total Freedom - Roy Wallis
>Inside Scientology - Robert Kaufman
>The Mindbenders - Cyril Vosper
>Religion Inc. - Stewart Lamont
>The Scandal of Scientology - Paulette Cooper
>Scientology: The Now Religion - George Malko
>Messiah or Madman? - Bent Corydon
>Dianetics in Limbo - Helen O'Brien
>A Doctor's Report on Dianetics - Joseph Winter
>Renunciation and Reformulation - Harriet Whitehead
>Believe What You Like - C. H. Rolph
>Cults of Unreason - Christopher Evans

- >The Commodore & The Colonels - John Forte
- >Naked Scientology - William S. Burroughs

Thanks for the list, Martin. A survey using this list could be done by ARSCC operatives in every library in the English speaking part of the world.

There was, I believe, a Guardian Order which specifically ordered the theft of critical books, which was called, I also believe "Operation Hydra." Do any of the former GO staff reading ars recall this operation?

(c) Gerry Armstrong

- >
- >There's no good reason that half of these books shouldn't be
- >in a large city library like that of Calgary, Victoria, or
- >Vancouver's massive edifice. Yet they are almost impossible
- >to find. Last time I checked Vancouver's library, one of
- >the largest, newest libraries on this continent, it had
- >one critical book listed - I could not find it on the shelves.
- >The VPL is within a few blocks of the cult's Vancouver storefront.
- >
- >More investigation into this is required; I'll try to engage
- >the librarians in this more. I note that there has been some
- >comment by a library journal on this issue; perhaps it needs
- >more attention.
- >
- >Ideally, of course, all these books should be reprinted in
- >mass quantities and distributed to libraries all over N.
- >America, the UK and Australia. I'd like to see half of this
- >list, as a minimum, available in at least one copy in every
- >major city's library and every university's library.
- >
- >What is needed is a wealthy philanthropist. Republishing
- >runs on the order of 10-50 thousand per title, I've been told.
- >I'd suggest a webpage store selling the books and the proceeds
- >used to donate copies to libraries. A lawyer is needed to
- >contact the publishers and work out copyright issues. Some
- >of the crit lit not listed above has not been published;

>these titles or the rights to print could possibly be purchased
>from their authors? In addition, an effort should be made to
>translate some of the European crit lit and publish in
>English editions. The logical choice of focus is the US,
>because that is the cult's powerbase.

>

>It should not be overlooked that many marks are sucked into
>the cult via such vehicles as Dianetics; if there are no
>opposing voices on the shelves, then more people will be
>sucked in and it will take longer to bring the cult to heel.

>

>--

>Cogito, ergo sum. <http://scientologysucks.lron.com>

>

> Watch TV: <http://www.com>

>

> Go to a protest in your area: <http://www.net/picket/>

>

> "When you attempt to cut a communication line, you get big
> problems. You can't block communication without getting upset
> and in a turmoil." - Scientology Director Jeff Quiros

> <info-trfn@theta.com>

>

> Hey, Jeff; what the fuck is your organization doing spamming
> the crap out of alt.religion.scientology then? Is this your
> idea of a "solution", spam the newsgroup forever, stick your
> head as far as possible up your ass, and pray it all goes away?

>

=====
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology
Subject: Re: To Russell on RPF
From: armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong)
Date: Fri, 10 Sep 1999 22:39:10 GMT

On Fri, 10 Sep 1999 11:10:06 -0400, Ed <metasyn@mind.net> wrote:

>

>

>Russell Shaw wrote:

>>

>

>[snipping long post by Stacy and Russell's replies up to this point:]

>

>>

>> I'm not - in any way - saying that being on the RPF, and having a rocky
>> marriage

>> wouldn't be life in hell. The *only* point with regard to that is that

>> ~RESPONSIBILITY~

>> doesn't fall at the feet of "management", or someone else.

>>

>

> I would like to cut through all the fog of words with a question here,
>Russell.

>

> Have you read the RPF stories on the net?

>

> And some more: Exactly how do you, personally, philosophically justify
>that your church imprisons many people and subjects them to RPF
>conditions? And others are imprisoned in "baby watch" situations as Lisa
>McPherson was?

>

> Okay, I'm sure you know plenty of people who graduated from the RPF
>and now say it was a wonderful learning experience, just as some people
>who have survived being in combat or being POWs say it builds character
>and self-discipline.

>

> But inevitably some people (even if a minority) in the RPF when they
>are in the ethics condition of Doubt follow the formula correctly; they

>realize and know with all their heart and soul that they have to leave
>Scientology, and your church continues to imprison them. And with no
>more recognition of their God-given human rights than the Nazis or
>Communist regimes grant. Your church only lets people out of their
>imprisonment situations when calculations of PR dictate it.
>
> I appreciate your willingness to communicate, and as a former Scn I
>know the value of communication, but after too many years of seeing the
>bad things and off-policy things get worse and worse, I reached a point
>after the early 1980s where it just became obvious that top management
>is simply evil and suppressive in a very big way. And they have
>consolidated their power. When a church in the United States of America
>runs private jails and thumbs their nose at our legal system, I'm
>concerned.
>
> Can't we have the freedom for Scientologists to do their thing
>(auditing and training) along with the freedom for Scientologists to
>apply Doubt and leave the church without hassle and for SO members to
>apply doubt and leave the SO without any fear of jail and torture?

Thank you for this post. Do we know each other from Scientology?

What you suggest is precisely what thinking critics have for years suggested, and Scientology has twisted into something else to maintain their rejection. Ha, ha, ha, ha.

There is a collision course between Scientology's determination to dominate, and thus in some way imprison, people, and the people's determination to have all men free. Very stupid of Scientology to be on the wrong side of this battle.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>
>Ed
>
>[rest snipped]

=====
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology

Subject: Re: Critics admit to being bigots and unworthy of being taken seriously. was:Re: Where is Vaughn Young

From: armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong)

Date: Sun, 12 Sep 1999 18:15:50 GMT

On Sun, 12 Sep 1999 13:42:45 -0400, lurkmonster <nada@noneya.com> wrote:

>On Sun, 12 Sep 1999 19:25:57 +0200, Zenon Panoussis <oracle@xs4all.nl>

>wrote:

>

>>

>>

>>lurkmonster skrev:

>>>

>>

>>

>>> >If you don't like it, go play with the other kids.

>>

>>> So you are saying that critics are not fair minded and will

>>> deliberately accuse Scientologists of doing things that they do not

>>> know Scientologists have done. You have just proven that the

>>> critics are bigots and should not be taken seriously.

>>

>>You can't read, can you? Would all caps help? IF YOU DON'T LIKE

>>IT, GO PLAY WITH THE OTHER KIDS. FYI, it's a more polite way of

>>saying "fuck off".

>>

>IF I DON'T LIKE YOU CRITIC OF SCIENTOLOGY BEING

>BIGOTS AND BEING UNWORTHY OF BEING TAKEN SERIOUSLY

>THEN I SHOULD "fuck off".

>Zenon do you think I have no right to protest what I feel is injustice

>in this NG?

Of course you do. On this newsgroup you can be as unjust as you want.

And by your communications ths far, you are as unjust as imaginable.

\$cientology, in fact, is that system which permits, rewards and expects injustice by its practitioners.

That is why people gather here, to protest and curtail \$cientology's injustice. You are here to promote injustice and attack the just. Yet this newsgroup is so confident in its ability to handle \$cientology injustice that it permits, rewards and expects you to come here to attack justice and the just.

We permit, reward and expect every inanity and nastiness the
\$cientologists with all their OT powerz and sooperior tech can concoct
in their injustice soaked minds.

L. Ron Hubbard deserved no one.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

>>And yes, you keep proving what I wrote about your purpose in this

>>newsgroup. And yes, I will now post 100 times "I will never again

>>reply to Lurkmonster".

>>

>Lurkmonster, Censored by Zenon on September 12, 1999. What happened

>to the freedom of speech you guys make so much noise about.

>Lurkmonster

>

>visit:

><http://www.freedominclearwater.org/>

><http://www.mentalhealthfacts.com>

><http://www.nopsychs.org/>,

=====
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology
Subject: The Dorian Challenge
From: armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong)
Date: Thu, 16 Sep 1999 11:19:10 GMT

Bob asked me some time ago if I was going to enter the Dorian Challenge. Bob called it something else. I called it the "Dorian Challenge" because it's a title, and I'm a titleist. I really have no idea if it's a correct title, or even if there hasn't already been another Dorian Challenge. The contest has nothing at all to do, of course, with Dorian. I say of "course," knowing that on ars there are a number of thinking participants who think otherwise, by not going beyond the four corners of contest. I know that Bob has Dorian as the inspiration, and well he might be, but the rules which form the challenge make it very clear that Dorian is not a factor.

In fact, because a contest entrant need not write as well as, better than, or similar to Dorian, there is no reason Dorian could not himself enter the contest. It could not be undivine if Dorian, an obviously literary man, won the first ever Dorian Challenge. I asked Bob if Dorian could enter, since the contest criteria in no way concern him, and I don't think Bob gave me a definite answer. If there's a vote on it, I would say that Dorian for sure should be able to participate in and win the Challenge.

The day Bob's challenge appeared I got to work and outlined my own essay submission. I read some of the discussion over the next few days, and wrote responses to a few of the posts on the subject of the contest; but never posted anything until now for one reason or another. I do that a lot. Much of life has to do with timing. From the start I thought that the contest is a very cool idea and a very worthy challenge. By the time Bob asked me if I was going to enter, I had already been thinking about it a bunch of days, and had pretty well, for reasons I'll state a little later in this post, decided. I told Bob some of this, and said I'd perhaps post some of my unposted responses and my decision.

Ars participant Baba ROM DOS, addressing Bob, wrote: "I do not doubt that I, among other contributors here, could outwrite your buddy "Dorian". But since you insist on being the sole judge, the game is rigged from the beginning. I'll be damned if

you're going to make me dance by waving your money around. Award the prize by vote of jury not beholden to you, and I'll think about it."

My fellow foot soldier Martin Hunt followed up: "Well said. You've driven to the heart of the matter; this is yet another of Bob's attacks on critics. The point of this exercise seems to be: 1. The "Dorian" troll is a wonderful, fantastic writer. 2. Bob is superiour to all critics. 3. The critics on ars are jerks to be toyed around with."

But demonstrably the point of the exercise is to produce within a month an essay of 10,000 words which is, as Bob requires, full of surprising, insightful, and thought provoking ideas, not only relevant to Scientology, but revealing its hidden workings and showing it for what it is; which doesn't lecture to Scientologists, but speaks indirectly to them, explaining some of the hows and the whys of what they have experienced; which opens up what L. Ron Hubbard Jr. (Nibs) referred to as the part of his father's mind that no one could get into, the part that was locked up tight, not revealed to anyone; which takes steps towards revealing Hubbard's true intent, and does all this in a manner that is compelling and convincing to Scientologists; and which, on top of everything else, says some significant and useful things about life in general.

That is to say, the point of the exercise is unrelated to whether Dorian is a wonderful writer, Bob is better, or we, the ars participants, are jerks being toyed with. The Challenge in no way attacks critics. Martin I know can with some ease produce an excellent essay within the guidelines. This Baba I don't know, but I know he says he can outwrite Dorian himself, so he is better than equally qualified. I would bet that an overwhelming majority of ars folks would look forward to an essay from Martin and Baba and every other critic of Scientology.

As for dancing to the waving of Minton money, no it's more like running in that it's a serious challenge. It is a bit like any prize fight or competition. A writing competition for a worthy cause. And as for the contest being rigged, sure it is. But its rigging is pretty well exposed. You can be reasonably certain that there is no one behind Bob to whom he is beholden. In almost all judgments I would rather trust Bob Minton than a

jury.

Boudewijn van Ingen, another always welcome ars participant, fired off this response to Bob's contest announcement: "A challenge to waste even more time on? Rob Clark said "More matter, less art!". So now you would like to see the opposite? <snip> Those of us that are out here to earn a quick buck might enjoy your hobby. These poor bastards have my blessing. <snip> I am not here to play. Scientology was deadly serious when they "played with" Lisa McPherson. So I will not shoot in the air. <snip>.

Flaming Bob's 8 rules for the Dorian Challenge, Boudewijn wrote: "You missed a couple of things, like: 9) It may not contain any references to actual, independently verifiable facts 10) It must be open to different interpretations. And of course the other part of this "deal" is that anybody that doesn't "win" gets to "shut-up". Wasn't that your general idea, Bob? <snip> If it's relaxation you want, you'd better drop your support for "Dorian", Bob. No amount of money you throw at it will buy you that otherwise."

I must say I don't think so to much of this. There is no reason why Dorian, with good sense, cannot be supported. All of Scientology's opponents should be supported with good sense, and it is abundantly clear that Dorian, while he may not be many things, is definitely an opponent. It is my understanding that Dorian has never asked for, nor even given the appearance of needing, money, and there is no evidence that Bob has thrown money at him. I see nothing in Bob's rules to support the charge that he wants participants in the Challenge who don't win to shut up. I think the contest is actually Bob putting his money where his free speech mouth is.

Sure the essay, and the essayist, must be open to different interpretations. Anyone who participates can be certain he will be interpreted in many different ways. All the interpretations in fact can be guaranteed to be misinterpretations. According to the rules, on the other hand, and contrary to what is insinuated, an entry may contain as many references to actual, independently verifiable facts as can be packed into ten thousand words. The essay, of course, is an artistic form for maximalizing matter, a form specifically intended to be packed with facts. This is a

fact.

I doubt that there are any of us who are out here to earn a quick buck. Because we're out here, however, for reasons other than earning a quick buck, why not earn a quick buck while we're at it? I can't recall any other such offer or contest since I've been on ars. Should we not hope that there would be large checks or even more valuable prizes awarded every week; perhaps Thursday afternoons. It isn't at all enjoying Bob's hobby, because Bob certainly, as opposed to Dorian, cannot participate in the contest in which he is the sole judge. This contest is for people with a hobby, or, I suppose, gift, or the Christians might say a burden, writing essays about Scientology and the dark side of L. Ron Hubbard.

Regarding shooting in the air, I would say don't do this if you haven't got a gun. Be deadly serious about deadly serious things, and if you can, shoot in the air. If shooting in the air is unsafe, discourteous or unwise, naturally, shoot as straight as possible somewhere else. Shooting in the air is not to be sneezed at. Isn't it a fact that Bob has not been bothered at his residence by Scientology's militiamen since he shot in the air? And isn't it a fact that up to the time of shooting in the air he had been bothered at his residence by this militia? I think everyone, Scientology's critics, and the head Scientologists too, whether they shoot or don't shoot, are deadly serious about Lisa McPherson.

Bob gave me much pause with my Dorian Challenge submission when I read his post stating: "I may even agree that no MFC members can participate but some smart-ass on ARS will have to name the MFC." I'm not a smart-ass, and I can't name the MFC, but I am, as everyone is, I'm sure, aware, a member in good standing. Now it is true that I am a member of many fan clubs, easily spanning the alphabet from Andreas to Zenon, but that fact doesn't detract from the threat my membership in the MFC appeared to be to my participation in this contest.

Lronscam, addressing Bob, brought up yet another problem: "you said that there are only a handful of people who could win. And out of that handful only a few who were allowed to participate, barring those who have injunctions against them." I have an injunction against me; one which "prevents" me from

mentioning Scientology, and which I violate every day without fail, just because it is illegal, impossible, unconstitutional, irresponsible, unenforceable, illogical, oppressive, suppressive, dangerous and flat out stupid.

But that same Scientology injunction also applies equally, and equally illegally, impossibility, unconstitutionally, irresponsibly, unenforceably, illogically, oppressively, suppressively, dangerously and flat out stupidly, to persons "acting in concert" with me. If Bob permits me to enter his contest, is he acting in concert with me and therefore subject to the same illegal, impossible, unconstitutional, irresponsible, unenforceable, illogical, oppressive, suppressive, dangerous and flat out stupid injunction? Since I'm also a member, as I mentioned, of the MFC, I am, as Poirot might say, on the dilemma's horns, n'est-ce pas?

I would think this might be the perfect opportunity for Bob to tell the Scientologists and their lawyers that their injunctions are illegal, impossible, unconstitutional, irresponsible, unenforceable, illogical, oppressive, suppressive, dangerous and flat out stupid by specifically inviting everyone, me included, who is gagged or shuddered by such Scientology documents to submit an essay. Bob is, of course, in a much different legal and financial position from what I am in, and a case can be made that I am suggesting what is easy for me to say. I am not a lawyer and my observations and opinions are not legal advice. But one way or another, Scientology's judicial suppression of free speech and the Dorian Challenge will intersect. Indeed haven't they?

I don't know if Lronscam ever got a response to the "suggestions, questions, ideas and comments" about Bob's contest. I thought this person Lronscam really cares, and is really serious about this great challenge, and needs to be cheered on.

L: Can the person remain anonymous, as with a pseudonym, and still win or do they have to give their real name -- ?

G: Anonymity, pseudonymity or cognominality, in the contest's context, are not factors. It will be a great day when anyone wins, whoever he or she is.

L: I mean openly, duh. Of course their real name will be divulged if they win.

G: Not necessarily. The two events are in all likelihood unrelated.

L: Does the literary work become your, Bob Minton's, property after all is said and done?

G: In that there is nothing in the contest rules regarding a transfer of ownership of the entrants' works, these works must remain the property of their creators.

L: Will there be a waiver of sorts to collect the money from you?

G: I have no idea what a waiver of sorts is, but Bob could open a Dorian Challenge account with a \$10,000 deposit.

L: Is this contest abiding by all laws in your jurisdiction?

G: Not in Scientology. But then Scientology has no jurisdiction. Where we stand is free and sacred ground and Scientology has no jurisdiction.

L: How will the check be presented?

G: Live on TV(R)?

L: As a gift (tax free, but possibly illegal) or less taxes? Roughly, people in America will get around 75% of it, if it is a bona fide contest. I don't know about other countries.

G: Writers, it should be remembered, have all sorts of writeoffs. And in a bona fide contest like the Dorian Challenge the writeoffs are especially bona fide.

L: In a later post, you said that there are only a handful of people who could win. And out of that handful only a few who were allowed to participate, barring those who have injunctions against them. That means you already have in mind who you like ahead of time which precludes most of 'us' from even getting a

chance.

G: We all know many of the handful. But I'd bet that the winner is surprisingly unknown. My dear Lronscam, you have a far greater chance of winning than I do, and I can, but you can't win if you don't write.

L: I like odds better than that.

G: I give more than even odds on everything. If you can get better than that for goodness sake go for it.

L: I may not participate at all anyway, but for those who are going to spend a great deal of time at this adventure, you should make it fairer to them and spell everything out in the open. There should be at least a week of setting down the rules and changing them per inquiry of an unfair bias.

G: That's what makes this such a challenging contest. One would have to write well. I think that on its face the contest is perfectly fair. It's better to have written and lost, even to unfair bias, than never to have written at all.

L: Some of my suggestions for rules are:
1) Pgp signed anonymous submission from the beginning to the end. For those who aren't familiar with PGP someone that would cause a problem. Make your anonymous PGP password simple. What happens if your password is forgotten? No win?.. If you're not anonymous you lose. How about if people guess who you are even if you are anonymous? I feel at a distinct disadvantage here.

G: Now there's a contest. But seriously, I would bet everyone, and certainly Bob, in my case, would know it was me inside the first paragraph. Everyone would know me the first time I laughed. Ha, ha, ha, ha, ha.

L: 2) Have at least 2 months to write essay after all rules are settled. The way I see it there are about 300 words per page in a normal novel. That makes 10,000 words equal, somewhere in the ballpark of 30 to 40 pages of work. That is 10% of a normal novel. 30 days is just not enough for those of us who hold normal jobs.

G: I'd have to agree and I'd suggest trying this cheer.
Two months or nothing. Two months or nothing. Two months or
nothing. Two months or nothing. Two months or nothing.

L: 3) There should be a vote of who is has the best work
before you make a decision, where everyone votes which is the
best and which isn't. No votes can come from an anonymous
remailer. All votes have to come from a valid Email
Address. One voter per address and you can't vote for
yourself.

G: Separate Readers Choice Award. Separate Readers Choice
Award. Separate Readers Choice Award. Separate Readers Choice
Award. Separate Readers Choice Award. Somebody other than Bob
could put up \$10,000 for a separate Reader's Choice Award. But
voting for yourself is always the least you can do.

L: You said that you are the decider of who wins and who
doesn't but you must take the totality of votes of who is the
winner with great weight. This is my general idea.

G: Great weight to the winner. Great weight to the winner.
Great weight to the winner. Great weight to the winner. Great
weight to the winner.

L: This process can cast a shadow over ARS if there are
possibilities that the contest is rigged.

G: A shadow on ARS. A shadow on ARS. A shadow on ARS. A
shadow on ARS. A shadow on ARS.

The contest is rigged. We're moving in. The contest is
rigged. We're moving in. The contest is rigged. We're moving in.
The contest is rigged. We're moving in. The contest is rigged.
We're moving in.

L: People in your immediate vicinity can not participate.

G: Wow, are there a bunch of essay-writing
Hubbard/\$cientology experts in some town in New Hampshire we've
never even heard of?

L: It must be voted on ahead of time to decide what

immediate vicinity is.

G: I vote for within the city limits of Sandown, NH.

L: It take it that Keith Henson would be glad to participate and I think that he would not like it if he is precluded from the get go.

G: Yeah, me too. I think Keith can meet all the criteria, and could produce a winner.

L: Stacy should definitely be precluded.

G: Boy I hope not. I think she could produce a dynamite essay. I would hate to have her excluded. But I know you're serious, so I'll say wouldn't it be hilarious, don't you think, if the only writers who can enter Bob's contest are those who can prove they despise him.

L: 4) You must define what a literary word is. Is it 5 digits including spaces or is it just any old word that counts as a word count?

G: I've always gone with the any old word definition. I think that counting only those words <----- there's two of them ---- of five digits will make this challenge more challenging than it ought to be.

L: These are just some of the questions that come up when someone enters any contest. These are my suggestions. Rules should be agreed upon and possible even written up by a lawyer. We don't need any lawsuits here on ARS.

G: That's actually the reason the lawyers shouldn't touch the rules. But what do you mean we don't need any lawsuits here on ARS? Of course we do. ARS is the torch that carves anvils into earrings. We need more lawsuits. However do you expect to go SP if you're not sued?

Since you are the contest rule maker, promoter and producer, it is best you decide before hand who should be allowed in the contest to begin with.

G: I agree. Let everyone in. Let everyone in. Let everyone in. Let everyone in. Let everyone in.

L: You don't need any OSA bots around putting forth their two cents.

G: Yes we do. Two cents from OSA. Two cents from OSA. Two cents from OSA. Two cents from OSA. Two cents from OSA.

L: and have Scientology come in with a lawsuit to break up the fun.

G: A lawsuit from Scientology can only heighten the fun. We want a lawsuit. We want a lawsuit. We want a lawsuit. We want a lawsuit. We want a lawsuit.

L: You never know do you; it could happen. This is their ball park when it comes to shit like this.

G: What is their ballpark? ARS? Shit like what? Like writing essays about them which pin their ears back?

L: They are the master when it comes to games,IMHO.

G: Their legacy will be their failure. They wake up every day to slave toward that legacy. They are not even the master of nothing.

L: One more thing. Can anyone tell me how much 10,000 words would be in Kilobytes? This may give a good indication of how much work is involved.

G: A lot of work. It's a difficult challenge. Make your words count.

But here's the deal on my membership in the MFC. I've hung out with Bob a number of times, always, I think, in other people's company, and I've talked to him by phone a number more. He didn't asked me to write or post this, nor did anyone else. He's never asked me to post anything.

I don't get everything that gets posted to ars and don't read a huge percentage of what I do get. I can't take much time

in this activity, and in what time I do take I probably get only a fraction done of what any normal wog can do. I say this to make it clear that I know I have but one point of view out of umpteen impossibillion points of view.

I have a Grade 11 education and know that my academic development does not go much beyond that. My religious convictions are, even for a prophet I would think, middle of the road toward liberal. Some at least of what I write here, and just about anywhere I can get away with it, is for not much more than its sound, although I try not to stray from the truth. That way, I don't have to keep much in mind and there's all this space for words.

I think a lot of people are very kind to me on ars when they really might want to wring my neck. There are some here, of course, who are very unkind and they also might want to wring my neck. I am grateful for every time my coparticipants chose kindness, and I am grateful to those who came to my defense, and pretty well anyone's defense here at the ars hdown (R).

Sometime after I first knew of Bob or had heard his name, I learned here on ars that he had, some months before, made an offer of \$360,000 to anyone who could get Scientology's tax exemption revoked. After giving this some thought I called Bob and said that I believed I could get Scientology's tax exemption revoked, and, reasoning that someone who has \$360,000 for one purpose probably has even more to do other things, asked him for a loan to be able to give it my best shot. I repay him upon completion of the project; that is, when the IRS tax exemption is revoked.

Now it isn't that I am any old guy who thought up such a cool venture. I have the undeniable need and the legal standing to effectively challenge Scientology's US-approved and defended status. Breckenridge, the MCCS tapes, the Zolin v. US cases, the CST v. US case, the religious persecution cases (CSI v. Armstrong, Marin Superior Court, US Bankruptcy Court), Scientology's IRS 1023 response, and my being where I was and am all add up to the requisite need and standing. The need and the legal standing to obtain the revocation of Scientology's tax exemption also makes me a bigger than life sized target.

and keep moving along toward victory. So in that sense, Bob has been kind, generous, understanding, validative, and fun. He sure seems to be in the same war I'm in and on the same side, and I'm honored to call him my friend.

Regarding Dorian, some time back someone asked on ars what the Dorian thing is all about, and I answered "broken glass bead game." I was referring to Hermann Hesse's novel *Magister Ludi,* titled in some printings, *The Glass Bead Game.*

I know I've been saying, and I still say, that God is the L[ong] F[all] B[low]D[own] F[loating]/N[eedle] answer to every properly asked L[isting] & N[ulling] question. What Hubbard called the LFB D F/N item, which according to him should be accompanied by other G[ood] I[ndicator]s including the T[one] A[rm] between 2.0 and 3.0, was simply the answer. He was wrong in his assignment of these E[nd]P[henomena]s, but he was right that questions had answers. Duh, you say?

And, as I've also been saying, and as everyone has noticed, I'm sure, just about any good rule is qualified by safety, courtesy and wisdom. So although God is the answer to the question, "What's the Dorian thing all about?" which is, by the way, a pretty good L & N question, it would be stupid to give that answer. "Broken glass bead game" still F/Ns for me. Perhaps it does for others as well.

It is actually inappropriate to call it a broken game, since it was not my game, and such a judgment on players is in almost all cases discourteous, unwise and even unsafe. My sole contribution to Dorian was to chime in, earnestly I think, a singled whispered name, "Leni Riefenstahl." And then I tried to cheer everyone up when the game, as I judged it, disassembled.

There were actual players whose contributions unfortunately went largely unapplauded, indeed unrecognized; and there were spectators and judges whose sentiments became, I can say with assurance, a more valued part of that particular glass bead game than the game itself. It may be that ars is not a fertile setting for glass bead games. I would myself not choose to develop one in certain settings; courtrooms for example. When the war is over, when we toast all the opponents to the Scientology octopus, when we toast Allard, Cooper, Whitney and Wollersheim, I know we'll

=====
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology,alt.clearing.technology
Subject: Re: Why "We're not a turn the other cheek kind of religion"
From: armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong)
Date: Tue, 28 Sep 1999 23:36:03 GMT

On Tue, 28 Sep 1999 17:45:01 GMT, mike@leptonicsystems.com (Mike O'Connor) wrote:

>In article <c568a05bf956c7ec8a6076c4b29df8ec@anonymous.poster>, Secret
>Squirrel <squirrel@echelon.alias.net> wrote:

>
>+++++++ SACRED CULT SCRIPTURE +++++++
>

>Now, if you want to hit somebody in the nose sometime and observe him -
>just walk down here on the street, walk up to a guy and, slam, hit him in
>the nose. Now, if this fellow is fairly low on the Tone Scale, he'll stand
>and think about it. And then he'll talk about it. The fellow who is high
>on the Tone Scale will simply slam you in the nose. He'll just return the
>motion, right now - pam! Simplicity. Very, very simple.

>
>Now, this business about "If he's low scale, how did he get low scale?"
>Well, he's been slammed in the nose often enough and then told that he
>mustn't return the action. All right, how is he told? Well, it's by being
>slammed in the nose the second he started to return the first slam in the
>nose. And then when he tried to return the second slam in the nose, he got
>the third slam in the nose. And when he tried to return the first, second
>and third slam in the nose, somebody hit him with a sledgehammer. And
>after that he thinks!

>
>Parents are always standing around saying to little Willy, "Now, you must
>think before you act. You should think things over. You shouldn't be
>compulsive, and so forth." Well, why don't they just take him out and
>chain him up to a post like an animal or something? Or just hang him? It
>would be kinder! Because the fellow who has to think before he acts, has
>to key in for himself a number of impacts, so that he can think.

>
> -- L. Ron Hubbard
> QUESTION AND ANSWER, STEP V
> 7 October 1953

>

>+++++

>

>My question here is: Isn't the scripture telling us the best thing to do
>is REACT WITHOUT THINKING? To be purely reactive, not to think about the
>response, but simply to react quickly and immediately? That thinking
>before you act is wrong?

Yes. It was Hubbard's intention to eliminate thinking altogether.
Auditing was drilled like that. The auditor could not think. He was
trained to react without thought. Thinking which went on through time
was figure-figure, which was audited as an aberration.

The problem with Hubbard's theory is that it's all backward; unless
you really do want to enslave your fellows. Thought isn't the problem.
It's what is being thought about. Hubbard tried to eliminate God-given
faculties.

Where this is observable most accutely in Scientology is their almost
total inability to forgive. To forgive requires something different
from a reaction. And forgiveness is what replaces a reaction (although
forgiveness takes no real time and reactions always take time).

Reacting is also a God-given faculty. It's just inappropriate when it
replaces forgiveness in human relations. Used without thought and
taking up the time something different from reaction could just as
well occupy, it observable in pretty well all autogenous human
tragedy.

Reaction, rather than thought, fits into Hubbard's mental and
organizational contruct because he was "creating" and had "created"
the perfect mind, which, being *cleared* (its held-down 7s allowed to
rise) always made the correct, most "pro-survival" decision,
according, of course to "the greatest good for the greatest number of
dynamics."

Remember when Kirstie Alley said, as reported in article earlier this
year, that what she looked for in a 2D was someone with a short comm
lag? Then there's the Hubbard pronouncement about coupling with
someone with the same comm lag. And another pronouncement where he

Re: Why "We're not a turn the other cheek kind of religion"

Page 3

states that the comm lag; i.e., the time it takes to repond to a communication, is the gauge of intelligence. This is a completely false concept, rewarding stupidity. Imagine a marriage in which forgiveness is impossible, where thought is eschewed.

All this is why \$cientology's new slogan "Think for yourself," is such a tragic hoot. Not only does \$cientology not want its members to think for themselves, \$cientology doesn't want them to think at all.

Think about that all you \$cientologists.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

>--

>Mike O'Connor - mike@leptonicsystems.com

><<http://www.leptonicsystems.com/>>

000269

Re: Hey, Bob Mittens!

Page 1

=====
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology
Subject: Re: Hey, Bob Mittens!
From: armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong)
Date: Tue, 28 Sep 1999 23:48:06 GMT

On Tue, 28 Sep 1999 13:05:35 -0400, Lronscam <NOSPAMLronsscaml@aol.com>
wrote:

>

>

>Stacy Brooks wrote:

>>

>> On Mon, 27 Sep 1999 23:46:49 -0700, Realpch <Realpch@aol.com> wrote:

>>

>> >Wulfen - www.total.net/~wulfen/scn/ wrote:

>> >>

>> >> <http://www.total.net/~wulfen/scn/adler.htm>

>> >>

>> >> (You'll understand when you read it.)

>> >

>> >It's gotta be a put-on, right? The spelling and grammar is just too

>> >wonderfully awful to be true.

>> >Peach

>>

>> I'm afraid I've seen lots of long-term Scientology staff members who are as

>> illiterate as this :(

>

>This makes sense. Scientologists read an awful lot but they don't write

>much.

No doingness. Improper balance of mass and significance.

I think \$cientologists generally (there are exceptions) write so
poorly, and indeed think so poorly, because there's no time to write
and think.

> There is no literate person in the world who naturally writes

>correctly. It takes time to process out the bugs, if you will. It could

000270

Re: Hey, Bob Mittens!

Page 2

>be said that Scientologists are put to sleep by reading too much of one
>subject and not having any input into what to do with all this data.
>Very few of them are aware of what the organization is really up to.

The continual stat push keeps them illiterate, unthinking and unaware.
What a technology!

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

>

>>

>> Stacy

000271

=====
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology
Subject: Re: Critical Ranking
From: armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong)
Date: Wed, 29 Sep 1999 23:59:44 GMT

On Tue, 28 Sep 1999 23:41:07 +0200 (CEST), Anonymous
<nobody@replay.com> wrote:

>Is there a ranking of, like, who the really good
>pickers are?

Yes. The Scientology cult is the ranker.

> I'm thinking that with this new
>IRC channel, someone must of like, decided on the
>parameters of membership, so they must have, you
>know, made up a list of the people who are good
>enough critics to get in on it.

They don't need to. As I explained, it's Scientology that does the
listing.

> I mean, it's like,
>not for just your Average Person who understands that
>Scientology is a cult and all, right?

Average people don't yet understand that Scientology is a cult and
all, but with Arnie's IRC, I'm quite sure, they soon will.

>You have to DO
>stuff to get to listen to the big dudes talk about
>their stuff, right?

Not at all. It's better if you don't do stuff to get to listen. Use
your ears, man. Be quiet.

> Cuz that's who I wanna be hanging
>around.

Yes, hang around people who you can listen to without having to do stuff.

> None of these everyday schmos who don't picket
>and all.

Who are these folks who don't picket?

> Not anybody who thinks that Bob and Stacy and
>Grady and Rod and those guys are flakes or anything.

Who are those guys?

Ha, ha, ha, ha, ha.

> I
>don't wanna be learning from anyone but THE BEST.

That's why I urge Scientologists like yourself to get out. You will not find THE BEST in Scientology. THE BEST are wogs. No one, no where is BETTER than a wog.

> They're
>the smart ones, right?

The smart ones are among the wogs. That's right.

> I like, lurk, so I'm not always
>sure who's the good guys and whos the bad guys.

Recall a time you were sure. ES to EP.

> I mean,
>I know the obvious bad guys, like those women that Bob
>always has to put in their place.

There is no place for women. Where do you put them?

> And that latest OSA

>Whore, that Kluge guy, who claims to not be an OSA Whore
>after Bob already said he was.

You know it's your buddy Dave Kluge who's the OSA Whore. Bob meant Dave, when he was writing to Karl. Dave is the OSA Whore. But he isn't the latest OSA Whore. Dave has been an OSA Whore, although at first he was known as a GO Whore, for probably half his lifetime.

> I mean, like, wow.

That means you're having a cognition.

>What
>nerve.

Your needle's got to be floating.

> Bob wouldn't of said it if he didn't have facts,
>right?

That's a good policy. You too shouldn't of said it without facts.

> Anyway, I hope I can get in Arnie's group so I can
>hear all the Real Critics talk about Scientology.

You really don't have to pay a pile of cash to become an auditor so you can hear. Just listen!

> What
>do I have to do?

The number of times over the material equals certainty. Just listen!

> I'm gonna go get my white sheet for the
>Clearwater picket...I cna't wait.

That will be cool. I'll bet lots of \$cientologists have their white sheets they can go get.

>

>And anyone who thinks I'm wrong, well, like, so what.

No you're right. But that also merits a "so what." It doesn't matter if you've been right or wrong, so what. The issue is to find out who it is that has been either right or wrong. Find out who you are.

>

>(That was good, huh Mr. Minton? did I do good? huh?)

Sure you did good. In Scientology nastiness is essential. But you've done that. You can't go on being nasty all your life. Become a wog. Exteriorizing from Scientology is the end of endless nastiness.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

>

>-----

>Hey you! Claim your FREE anonymous email account: <http://www.anonymous.to>

>

=====
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology

Subject: Re: ARS Literati \$10,000 Challenge----MAJOR RULE CHANGE

From: armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong)

Date: Thu, 30 Sep 1999 00:28:18 GMT

On Tue, 28 Sep 1999 04:23:38 GMT, Spiritual Research Workgroup
<info@sgmt.at> wrote:

>On Mon, 27 Sep 1999 13:37:56 GMT, armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong) wrote:

>

>

>>Scientology as a thought system is as unspiritual as as any other
>>unspiritual system. What would be so terrible if you recognized this?
>>Scientology wouldn't change one iota.

>

>

>Well, if the idea that theta (the spirit) is the governing factor
>of life and that it survives physical death is not spiritual,
>then what IS spiritual?!?!?

That spirit may be the governing factor of life and that it survives physical death does not make asking questions and getting answers a spiritual procedure. Unless a lawyer asking questions and getting answers or a cop asking questions and getting answers or a phone sex merchant asking questions and getting answers is spiritual. The lawyer, the cop and the phone wench are all governed by spirit which survives physical death. So are Scientologists governed by spirit which survives death.

What is spiritual is what is unchanging. Scientology deals with what changes. People in Scientology become "more aware," "more able," "more intelligent." They believe they're making changes in awareness, ability and intelligence. Changes in awareness, ability and intelligence can be made by sleep, air, food, exercise, alcohol, drugs, study, etc., etc. Those are not spiritual exercises, unless all activities are considered spiritual exercises. Spiritual exercises might be the contacting of that which doesn't change.

Removal of the impediment to contacting what doesn't change (and has

000276

never gone anywhere) is accomplished by forgiveness. Forgiveness is recognizing that the impediments don't exist. Forgiveness is not itself really spiritual, because it doesn't go through time unchanged, in fact will in time disappear, but it is the human activity closest to and in the direction of what doesn't change.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

>

>

>

>

>

>Heidrun Beer

>

>Workgroup for Fundamental Spiritual Research and Mental Training

><http://www.sgmt.at>

=====
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology
Subject: Re: First Annual ARS Literati Challenge---The Winners
From: armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong)
Date: Fri, 01 Oct 1999 15:29:10 GMT

On Fri, 01 Oct 1999 08:54:35 GMT, "Russell Shaw" <rshaw@dancris.com>
wrote:

>
>©Anti-Cult® - www.users.wineasy.se/noname/ wrote in message
><37f3936d.19963834@ARSCC.Sweden.Dep.OSA.Surveillance>...
>>On Thu, 30 Sep 1999 09:01:27 -0700.
>>In Message-ID: <37F38957.452550A5@pacbell.net>
>>barb <bwart@pacbell.net>.
>>From: Pacific Bell Internet Services.
>>Wrote on the subject: Re: First Annual ARS Literati Challenge---The
>>Winners:
>>
>>>Bah, Sten. Sour grapes.
>>>Thanks to this contest, we have some dynamite material by some very
>>>creative individuals, which can be used to continue our efforts to
>>>spread the word about Scientology.
>>
>>No sour grapes Barb. I've said it before and I say it again: I'll never
>>accept a dime from Bob Minton, no matter what.
>>
>>Sten-Arne
>
>Never say never, Sten-Arne. Bob may be - right this very minute - working
>on a new and exciting contest that will grab the interest of everyone on ARS
>(and unite them like never before!).

Don't suck up to Sten-Arne. He would even take money from Bob Minton
before he becomes a Scientologist.

Your sarcasm is our gauge, by the way, of the contest's success.

>
>The essays that could come out of *that* contest (bound into books, of

>course) along with any random years worth of all the postings here on ARS -
>bound into that same VERY large volume, is just going to get Scientologists
>into Bob's camp like never before.

Look, the wogs, or as you term us, Bob's camp, stand with arms wide open to welcome Scientologists back from that sorry trip. We welcome you Russell. We do all sorts of things to get Scientologists to return to wogland (R) where love is possible and where beings are free to rise to any height. One of the things we wogs do to rescue Scientologists is to write about our knowledge of the Scientology trap and its necessary evils. Many things we wogs do are just going to get Scientologists back like never before.

>
>If Bob would also underwrite the cost of publishing such a volume - guys
>like you could make a damn nice living selling those books door to door.
>That way you too could wind up with some of the Minton Money - but not have
>to dirty your hands by taking it directly.

They would have to dirty their hands by writing. We haven't seen your essay, Russell, illuminating the dark recesses of L. Ron Hubbard's mind or his hidden intentions.

But what are you? You have no standing to judge the cleanliness of money. You're a real estate agent, for God's sake.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>
>
>I think college administrators should encourage students to urinate on walls
>and bushes, because then when students from another college come sniffing
>around, they'll know this is someone else's territory.
> - Jack Handy
>
>
>

=====
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology
Subject: Re: To Be OR Not TO Be
From: armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong)
Date: Fri, 01 Oct 1999 15:23:35 GMT

On Fri, 01 Oct 1999 11:43:04 GMT, msilver7000@my-deja.com wrote:

>To be or not to be, That is
>the question. I mean, it
>sounds really keen to be a
>Scientologist, to be clear, to
>be an operating theton and
>rule the universe with
>certainly...but...how do you
>explain the behaviour of
>someone who has attained
>the status of a mini god and
>yet acts in the way described
>on the net. You know what I
>mean. Why go into specifics.
>We all know what they, the
>mini gods of the universe do.
>But why?

Common, garden variety willfulness. But willfulness made "right" by "agreement." And willfulness's might, the might of numbers and money and all the weapons of willfulness mountains of money can buy. Who but a saint, with all those numbers and all that money, could resist the temptation to willfulness?

> What happened to
>the ethical side of the
>religion?

There never really was much of an ethical side for anything to happen to. And it has never been much of a religion. It is, if we accept that all activity can be religious, a religion of willfulness. A religion of irreligiosity.

=====
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology
Subject: Re: First Annual ARS Literati Challenge---The Winners
From: armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong)
Date: Fri, 01 Oct 1999 22:25:38 GMT

On Fri, 01 Oct 1999 07:49:49 -0700, Grady Ward
<grady@promisecreepers.org> wrote:

>
>>
>>Never say never, Sten-Arne. Bob may be - right this very minute - working
>>on a new and exciting contest that will grab the interest of everyone on ARS
>>(and unite them like never before!).
>
>The topic will be:
>
>"The Secret Crimes of Wendy and Russell Shaw"
>all entries will be professionally bound and gagged.

DM knows their secret crimes. And it appears Europe has grasped that
his accumulation of good people's secret crimes is, if not itself a
crime, at least an invasion of privacy.

Russell Shaw, let me tell you, it's a lot better for the good people
out here to know your secret crimes than it is for DM and his henchmen
to know them.

And I accept that you are not one of his henchmen. That makes it a
little easier to leave, thank God.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>
>

=====
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology
Subject: Re: PC folders and culling.
From: armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong)
Date: Sat, 02 Oct 1999 18:43:22 GMT

On Sat, 02 Oct 1999 18:03:14 GMT, thomlove
<thomlovenetmail@netscape.com> wrote:

>Hello Garry;

~~~~~

The other guy.

>

>Re; you data on the culling of folders, could you post it for us, so we could  
>download it and keep it for any future defense?

I'll dig up what I can.

I think this is going to be a very big issue for the cult in the future. There was something in the Belgian raid reports indicating they've got Scientology's number about pc files. I'm grateful I've been able to stay unsilent to see this time arrive.

Mi\$cavige, for a me\$\$ of pottage, and all his regime, are in a continual, every day of the year, condition of treason to everyone, Scientologist and wog alike.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

>Thanks.

>

>ThomLove

>

>gerry armstrong wrote:

>

>> On 2 Oct 1999 16:53:13 GMT, wbarwell@starbase.neosoft.com (William

>> Barwell) wrote:

>>





---

Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: PC folders and culling.  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong)  
Date: Sat, 02 Oct 1999 16:51:32 GMT

-----  
On 2 Oct 1999 16:53:13 GMT, wbarwell@starbase.neosoft.com (William Barwell) wrote:

>  
>  
>Recently, in other newsgroups, I have been playing truth squad to  
>some low level Scientologists playing cult salesmen to netizens.  
>One of the issues I discussed was the practice of culling folders  
>for dirt and blackmail material.  
>  
>As usual, the cult has some boilerplate denials webbed which is  
>used by clams as 'proof' this sort of stuff does not happen.  
>But it does.  
>  
>Well over a year ago, I suggested it was time to start a project  
>to collect all that can be found on this practice, including  
>laws suits, declarations, personal experiences, official HCOBs, HCOPLs,  
>OODs, GO orders and other stuff pertaining to PC folders and culling  
>these folders.  
>  
>But this was during an ear of fierce ARS flame wars and legal  
>activities and was pretty much drowned out and ignored.  
>  
>I suggest it is time again to start this as a group project.  
>  
>Basically, to start, what is needed is old hands to explain, what exactly  
>auditing is, when it starts, how it is done, how the folders are  
>created and handled, the basic procedures as per CoS policy, how policy  
>works out in reality, when the digging for personal dirt starts,  
>how C/S handle auditors, PCs and files.  
>  
>The basics to begin with. Only those who have been in the cult for some  
>time can really explain this.  
>



>Then what is needed is to dig up when the culling started, how  
>this was engineered, the mechanisms, the HCOPLs or whatever.  
>  
>I know that we have had several people in ARS in the past who  
>admitted they did play some role in stuff like this or witnessed it.  
>  
>Some info is around like the stipulation of evidence signed by Mary Sue  
>Hubbard and others. I believe the sentencing memorandum also mention this  
>and fair game, but I have not been able to find this memorandum on the  
>net.  
>  
>Basically, one's PC folders are still fair game for Ethics and culling  
>and the cult lies about this to raw meat. It is time to start a project  
>rolling to make sure that there is no doubt that this was policy, is still  
>policy, what auditing really is and how the cult lies about this so  
>critics will eventually have inarguable websites to point newbies to  
>when the issue arises.  
>  
>They still lie about the abuses, they have websites with soothing  
>prevarications their apologists point to, the cult has it lip  
>service creeds and auditor's promises and other high sounding  
>lies, begging for exposure.  
>  
>Anybody game for this?

Yes. I have a great deal of documentation on this Scientology criminal practice.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>  
>Like I say, what is really needed to begin is, a good basic  
>step by step explanation how raw meat is handled and how  
>auditing drifts step by step into gathering information on  
>all one's crimes and doings.  
>  
>To the point one can start having a PC folder worth culling.  
>And when one starts getting involved with Ethics.  
>  
>Really, this has not been explained in a full and easily understood

- >manner for critics and raw meat who have not experienced what
- >really happens in auditing, and when the rot starts in the system, the
- >manipulation and games.
- >
- >Anybody interested?
- >
- >Has auditing cchnaged over the years? Was it different in teh 50's, the
- >early 60's? Were their changes when Hubbard became paranoid?
- >When did sec checks begin? When did culling begin? Did this
- >preceed the GO and Mary Sue's orders to cull PC folders?
- >
- >Pope Charles
- >SubGenius Pope of Houston
- >Slack!
- >





=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: And not one word from Bernie  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (germy armstrong)  
Date: Sat, 02 Oct 1999 14:45:50 GMT  
-----

On Sat, 02 Oct 1999 06:22:39 -0500, Tommy <Tommy\_sp\*\*gespam@Xs.net>  
wrote:

>Anton Hein wrote:

>>

>>

<http://asia.yahoo.com/headlines/011099/world/938784600-91001133058.newsworld.html>

>>

>> :====Begin Quote====

>> Controversial Church of Scientology under gun in Belgium

>> BRUSSELS, Oct 1 (AFP) - The controversial Church of Scientology was again under  
>> the gun in western Europe Friday after simultaneous raids and seizures of its  
>> documents in Belgium and France, the Brussels prosecutor said Friday.

>> Jos Colpin, spokesman for the prosecutor's office, told AFP Belgian police with  
>> warrants swooped on 25 locations Thursday, searching premises, seizing  
>> bookkeeping documents and temporarily detaining people for questioning.  
>>

>> He said two such searches were also carried out in Paris at the request of  
>> Belgian authorities, but added that no charges were yet pending against the  
>> church in either country, and that all those questioned had been released.  
>>

>> "The files on Scientology members are not simply membership contracts," said  
>> Colpin. "They contain highly personal information. So the investigation could be  
>> expanded to include violation of privacy laws."  
>>

>> The seizures resulted from a fraud and abuse complaint filed in Brussels in 1997  
>> by a former member of the church seeking recovery of money she had paid.  
>>

>> They followed close on the heels of a high-profile trial in Marseille, southern  
>> France, in which seven scientologists were charged with fraud.  
>>

>> The prosecutor in that trial, which concluded on September 23, argued that  
>> "beneath the religion there is a clear, institutionalised business drift" in  
>> which church officials practised "mental manipulation" to extort money from



>> people with problems.

>>

>> A verdict is to be handed down November 15 against the seven, who face up to  
>> five years in jail and stiff fines if convicted for alleged swindles between  
>> 1987 and 1990 on behalf of the church, which is officially listed as a sect in  
>> France.

>>

>> Among the Belgian premises searched Thursday, in Brussels, Malines, Louvain, and  
>> Heidonck, were the current and former headquarters of the church, and a variety  
>> of groups and businesses called Citizens Commission on Human Rights, U-Man  
>> Belgium, Valgo International Consult, PR Consult, Impact Consulting, Delta, and  
>> Advance Consulting.

>>

>> "These commercial concerns are offering so-called management training to  
>> established companies in order to gain their sympathy," said the prosecutor's  
>> spokesman.

>>

>> In 1997, prosecutors testifying before a Belgian parliamentary committee called  
>> the Church of Scientology one of the country's three largest movements, with  
>> some 5,000 members.

>>

>> The Los Angeles-based church, founded in 1954 by the late science-fiction author  
>> L. Ron Hubbard, offers self-improvement and self-healing courses on the basis of  
>> Hubbard's writings, which spell out principles he called scientology and  
>> dianetics.

>>

>> The prosecutors told the committee the church charged 8,000 to 80,000 Belgian  
>> francs (200-2,000 euros, 8,368-20,920 dollars) for its courses.

>>

>> The church claims six million members worldwide and an estimated 300 million  
>> dollars in assets.

>>

>> The Marseille trial was highlighted by accusations the Church of Scientology had  
>> a "mole" in the French presidency and tried to infiltrate defence and police  
>> departments.

>>

>> It was also enlived by the suspicious destruction of mountains of state's  
>> evidence just before the trial began.

>>

>> American actor John Travolta, a member of the church who happened to be in Paris

>> at the time for a Scientology wedding, beat a hasty retreat home when he  
>> realized the trial was in progress for fear, his entourage said, that he might  
>> be called as a witness.

>>

>> :===End Quote===

>>

>> Anton

>> --

>> Proudly internetting from XS4ALL - a Scientology-censored ISP

>> Here's What Scientology Doesn't Want You To Know:

>> <http://www.apologeticsindex.org/s04.html>

>

>

>Hey Bernie - comments?

I was wondering, surely Bernie, as a Scientology operative in Belgium,  
you have to be in some of those files that got seized?

Tell us at least what you're able to.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

>

Tommy

>

>--

>Thank you for your very detailed letter regarding

>Scientology. We haven't yet found a way to attack

>these jackals who feed on children and young adults

>who are too emotionally weak to stand by themselves

>when they reach the age of consent.

>

>Congressman Leo J. Ryan, shortly before being gunned down

>by another cult in Jonestown





=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: ARS Literati \$10,000 Challenge - Judge's Report www  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong)  
Date: Sat, 02 Oct 1999 14:23:52 GMT  
-----

On Sat, 02 Oct 1999 07:43:56 GMT, martin@islandnet.com (Martin Hunt) wrote:

>Ted.Mayett@worldnet.att.net (Ted Mayett) wrote:

>

>>Or do we mail out 150,000 copies of Joes essay and watch the orgs  
>>close down this month? What I'm saying is that I don't think any  
>>essay matched the criteria, as it is not possible for one essay to get  
>>through to the hard-core member.

>

>There was a letter passed around the orgs a long time ago  
>that I believe did have this effect on people; wasn't it the  
>Dane Tops letter?

It may be that the Dane Tops letter had such an effect, according to this report, \*because\* it was passed around the orgs. Joe's essay equally might if it was passed around the orgs.

There's the task, getting literature passed around the orgs. You can bet that the Miscavige regime has taken steps to prevent anything from ever being passed around the orgs again. But it will happen. And we don't know what piece of literature will be the first one, or the only, or the first in a wave, that will get passed around. It could be Joe's essay, and I thought it could have been any of those that I judged, in my judgment, to match the criteria.

It is extremely important that there is a body of literature available for the people who escape Scientology. It might be something from that body which springs a person. Or it may not be reading at all, but some other catalyst.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

00029090





=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: My Experience  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong)  
Date: Sat, 02 Oct 1999 17:04:26 GMT  
-----

On Sat, 02 Oct 1999 16:27:48 GMT, msilver7000@my-deja.com wrote:

>I was in Sci. in 76. The org.  
>was a small facility on Santa  
>Monaca Blvd. in West LA.  
>The most pronounced thing I  
>noticed about the  
>environment was a kind of  
>sterility, the florescent lights  
>and the omnipresent stench  
>of cigarette smoke. The  
>small cubicles called  
>auditing rooms where full of  
>busy people and naturally  
>there was the  
>communications room where  
>the TR drills where taking  
>place. It all seemed fun but  
>the strange thing about it  
>was, I always felt out of  
>place, like this was more of a  
>'pushy', let's make a deal  
>atmosphere, always wanting  
>money from me for this or  
>that course. One time, an  
>auditor blew cigarette smoke  
>in my face, I think to get  
>some kind of 'read' on the  
>emeter. Another auditor was  
>pregnant. She was nice and I  
>told her that she should take  
>care of herself when I  
>noticed that she could hardly  
>keep her eyes open during



>auditing.

That's funny. There were times when I felt sorry for my "auditor," and wanted to F/N to "save" them. What a sorry tech.

>When I saw her a  
>few months later, she told  
>me that she had lost her  
>baby from a miscarriage. I  
>felt a little responsible for  
>this but she didn't seem to  
>care.

That, on the other hand, is really sad.

> Another time, when my  
>money had run out, maybe a  
>few hundred left in the bank,  
>the manager sat me down in  
>her office and first declared  
>that she was going to smoke  
>even after I told her not to.

Scientology, the religion of willfulness.

>She then proceeded to tell  
>me why the case supervisor  
>wanted 'all' the rest of my  
>money.

Yep, that sounds like a standard Scientology C/S order. "Audit this pc until his money runs out."

>

>I gave it to them. I think the  
>reason Sci. never worked for  
>me was that I was doing TM  
>at the time.

The reason Scientology didn't work for you is because it doesn't work

for anyone. There are no clears, and the clears Scientology says are clear, are clear liars.

- > During the last
- > few hours of auditing, to use
- > up the remaining few
- > hundred dollars I had, I
- > declared that the experience
- > I had with TM,
- > Transcendental Meditation
- > was exactly like 'Serenity of
- > Beingness', the highest tone
- > on the Sci. tone scale.

That must have brought in your auditor's GIs.

- > The
- > auditor just looked up at me
- > and scoffed at the statement,
- > no acknowledgment as
- > they're supposed to do
- > during an auditing session.

What auditors are supposed to do during an auditing session is a cover for what they're actually doing -- audit the pc until his money runs out.

- >
- > In 81, I believed that I had
- > gone clear during those
- > auditing sessions in 76 but
- > was never attested to having
- > done so by the Sci. org. I
- > went to the Hollywood Org.
- > to find out if this was indeed
- > true. After a list of questions
- > was read to me during an
- > auditing session to
- > determine this, they said, 'we
- > recommend that you take



>DCSI, Dianetic Clear Special  
>Intensive', which indicated  
>that, yes, you are clear but  
>need this extra course to  
>clean up your state of clear. I  
>never did. I repeated this in  
>New York a few years later  
>with the same results.

It sounds like you're now clear of Scientology. Being clear of  
Scientology, I assure you, is better than being clear \*in\*  
Scientology.

>  
>I've come to three major  
>conclusions about  
>Scientology.  
>  
>1. An organization and its'  
>knowledge cannot be apriori,  
>above the spirit that creates  
>it.

Check.

>  
>2. The number of one billion  
>years as the contracted time  
>one must stay in Sci. is the  
>amount of time it takes to  
>complete one course of Sci,  
>OR ten million life times if  
>one hundred years is the  
>average life. After one billion  
>years, one receives a  
>diploma and is allowed to  
>leave or start over again.

One can complete his Scientology course by escaping from the trap.  
Walking or running away works.

>

>3. A spirit can never be  
>enlightened by an  
>organization it creates since  
>the spirit is apriori or above,  
>spiritually speaking, to its'  
>creation.

And amen to that.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

>

>Sent via Deja.com <http://www.deja.com/>  
>Before you buy.





Re: World Association of Hubbard Enterprises???

Page 1

=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology

Subject: Re: World Association of Hubbard Enterprises???

From: armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong)

Date: Thu, 07 Oct 1999 23:52:04 GMT

-----  
On 7 Oct 1999 15:56:13 -0700, Dead ElRon <Dead\_ElRon@FireyHell.Org>  
wrote:

>Anyone know what this 'charitable' organization does?

Makes money. Makes more money. Makes other people make more money.  
What's a charitable organization to do?

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>  
> WORLD ASSOCIATION OF HUBBARD ENTERPRISES  
> CT NUMBER: 83549  
>  
> Mailing Address:  
> WORLD ASSOCIATION OF HUBBARD ENTERPRISES  
> C/O MICHAEL STOLLER  
> 10940 WILSHIRE BLVD - 18TH FLOOR  
> LOS ANGELES, CA 900243925  
>

000296

97





=====

Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology

Subject: Re: OEC vol 7 out - grab it! (was Re: Zenon - not crushed yet?)

From: armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong)

Date: Thu, 07 Oct 1999 20:34:18 GMT

-----

On Wed, 06 Oct 1999 15:10:15 -0700, Grady Ward

<grady@promisecreepers.org> wrote:

>

>>

>>The red volumes have all been posted here by you though you may not know  
>>it (see how powerful those OTs are?). They have been posted as the  
>>HCOPLs which they were not. They were all HCOBs as found in the old tech  
>>volumes. These were the ones typed into computer by the CoS themselves  
>>and have the identifiers of the typists at the top of each issue.

>>

>

>But wait a minute. Wasn't the whole point of the RMGROUP by Helena  
>Kobrin and all the lawsuits to prevent just this thing from happening?

But wait another minute. Does this mean what I think it means? What,  
ten, lawsuits later, and x millions on lawyers, y millions more on  
PIs, z millions on computers and all that stuff, and it's their own  
unbrainwashed disciples getting the word out?

Scientology is a failure of brainwashing. Think about it. It didn't  
work with Michael Meisner. With Jim Dincalci. With Gerry Armstrong.  
With Vaughn and Stacy. Jesse Prince-- does he seem brainwashed?

It has failed in its efforts to apply its fraudulent brainwashing tech  
to non-Scientologist wogs as well. Grady is a good example of a  
non-Scientologist wog on whom Scientology's brainwashing tech has  
failed utterly.

I think we will see an outpouring of what had been by all indicators  
brainwashed prewogs. I think we will see that virtually everyone who  
could previously have been classified as brainwashed will be free to  
know they're free. Then we will be able to say that Scientology  
brainwashing doesn't exist. Right now we know it doesn't work. We just

Re: OEC vol 7 out - grab it! (was Re: Zenon - not crushed yet?)

Page 2

have to get the word to those who aren't permitted to hear it.

>

>Why isn't Chief Petty Officer Warren McShane or "Rear" Admiral

>David Miscavige doing something about this?

Long live Zenon!

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

>

000298





=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: Resist Personal Attacks  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong)  
Date: Thu, 07 Oct 1999 20:34:03 GMT  
-----

On 7 Oct 1999 19:09:34 GMT, ceon@u.washington.edu (Ceon Ramon) wrote:

>In article <37fc46b2.0@news2.lightlink.com>,  
>Russell Shaw <rshaw@dancris.com> wrote:  
>>  
>>Grady Ward wrote in message ...  
>[...]  
>>>Russell,  
>>>  
>>>If you are against personal attacks, why did you lie for ever so long  
>>>by putting on a web page that I had cheated my mother out of \$1,234.80?  
>>>  
>>  
>>Grady,  
>>  
>>As you have protested that \*particular point\* numerous times, let me  
>>publicly apologize to you for that having been on my web page. For the  
>>record, I totally believe you when you say you did NOT cheat your mother out  
>>of \$1,234.80. You \*had\* to show the debt in your bankruptcy papers, but you  
>>later paid her in full. I got it. And I believe you, when you say that you  
>>later paid her back. I am sorry for any upset I caused by having that on my  
>>web site.  
>>  
>>Russell Shaw  
>>6 Oct 99  
>  
>Thank you, Russell. I'm impressed. That web page you hosted has been a  
>sore point with me for as long as it's been up, and the source of my  
>feelings of distrust and antagonism toward you. I'd be very glad to be  
>able to think well of you.  
>  
>Now: if you'd just apologize to the others who have been maligned on that  
>page. You have the opportunity to be a good representative of your religion  
>and show the world how honorable and generous a real Scientologist can be.

>

>I can promise you that this would do more to change the minds of critics  
>and newcomers to a.r.s. than anything else you could do.

>

>At the very least it would confuse the hell out of some people :-)

Oo, oo, let me be confused.

Heh Russ, in case you missed it, here's an earlier post:

[Quote]

From: armstrong@dowco.com (germy armstrong)  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: Resist Personal Attacks  
Date: Wed, 06 Oct 1999 19:22:42 GMT  
Message-ID: <37fb9fb3.22986442@news.dowco.com>  
References: <37F3FDEA.440E58EA@pacbell.net>  
<37f60372.2436507@enews.newsguy.com> <37F77B31.5AE6D14E@pacbell.net>  
<37f7908a.16942064@enews.newsguy.com>  
<EaD3N+jrwhy154GTF3vce7Tlp4Pk@4ax.com>  
<v6v3Nx61ydm+r9xcEHuMnZlQ7iTi@4ax.com>  
<37f7bb48.27885861@enews.newsguy.com>  
<mike-0310991959410001@167.206.94.159>  
<37f83680.0@news2.lightlink.com>  
<mike-0410991058410001@167.206.94.159>  
<37f9af50.0@news2.lightlink.com>  
<mike-0510991129550001@167.206.94.159>  
<37faf17d.0@news2.lightlink.com>  
<Dl37N=jPkdgG=C0B0ca+t+YQi94@4ax.com>  
X-Newsreader: Forte Free Agent 1.11/16.235  
NNTP-Posting-Host: dial-027.tchl.chw.dowco.com  
X-Trace: 6 Oct 1999 12:33:25 -0800, dial-027.tchl.chw.dowco.com  
Lines: 35  
Path: news.vphos.net!dial-027.tchl.chw.dowco.com  
Xref: ares.vphos.net alt.religion.scientology:1147527

On Wed, 06 Oct 1999 07:31:47 -0700, Grady Ward  
<grady@promisecreepers.org> wrote:



>

>>

>>Yes it is. And I am also looking forward to you bringing this point up  
>>whenever you see any of the critics making personal attacks on LRH, or  
>>church management.

>>

>

>

>Russell,

>

>If you are against personal attacks, why did you lie for ever so long  
>by putting on a web page that I had cheated my mother out of \$1,234.80?

Yes, Russell, you have never taken any responsibility for the personal attacks on your hate page. You accepted black PR personal attacks on me and others from your Scientology seniors and put it on a web page to cause us all the harm black PR is intended to cause.

I've never put up a Russell Shaw hate page. Yet you put up a Gerry Armstrong hate page. Perhaps your point is that this makes you better than me?

Don't you think it's time to come clean about your hate site and your connections to the Miscavige regime?

(c) Gerry Armstrong

[End Quote]

And then, lo and behold, as Dylan says, you post this:

[Quote]

From: "Russell Shaw" <rshaw@dancris.com>  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: Resist Personal Attacks  
Date: Thu, 7 Oct 1999 00:08:55 -0000  
Organization: Lightlink Internet  
Lines: 31  
Message-ID: <37fc46b2.0@news2.lightlink.com>



References: <37F3FDEA.440E58EA@pacbell.net>  
<37f60372.2436507@enews.newsguy.com> <37F77B31.5AE6D14E@pacbell.net>  
<37f7908a.16942064@enews.newsguy.com>  
<EaD3N+jrwhy154GTF3vce7Tlp4Pk@4ax.com>  
<v6v3Nx61ydm+r9xcEHuMnZlQ7iTi@4ax.com>  
<37f7bb48.27885861@enews.newsguy.com>  
<mike-0310991959410001@167.206.94.159>  
<37f83680.0@news2.lightlink.com>  
<mike-0410991058410001@167.206.94.159>  
<37f9af50.0@news2.lightlink.com>  
<mike-0510991129550001@167.206.94.159>  
<37faf17d.0@news2.lightlink.com>  
<Dl37N=jPkdqgG=C0B0ca+t+YQi94@4ax.com>  
NNTP-Posting-Host: 205.232.34.12  
X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3  
X-NNTP-Posting-Host: 24.6.161.155  
Path:  
news.vphos.net!news.idt.net!attmtf!ip.att.net!remarQ-easT!supernews.com!remarQ.com!  
news.lightlink.com!news2.lightlink.com!24.6.161.155  
Xref: ares.vphos.net alt.religion.scientology:1149883

Grady Ward wrote in message ...

>

>>

>>Yes it is. And I am also looking forward to you bringing this point up  
>>whenever you see any of the critics making personal attacks on LRH, or  
>>church management.

>>

>

>

>Russell,

>

>If you are against personal attacks, why did you lie for ever so long  
>by putting on a web page that I had cheated my mother out of \$1,234.80?

>

Grady,

As you have protested that \*particular point\* numerous times, let me publicly apologize to you for that having been on my web page. For the record, I totally believe you when you say you did NOT cheat your mother out of \$1,234.80. You \*had\* to show the debt in your bankruptcy papers, but you later paid her in full. I got it. And I believe you, when you say that you later paid her back. I am sorry for any upset I caused by having that on my web site.

Russell Shaw  
6 Oct 99

[End Quote]

So let me too congratulate you on your positive steps. Don't forget that the SP Grady Ward is the inspiration and source of that case gain, not Scientology and what it taught you. Grady had to, as you say, protest the \*particular\* black PR numerous times, for you to grasp that it might not be true. Who, on God's green earth, has Grady's gargantuan persistence against Scientology's fair game apparatus?

So, now, Russ, you have to represent all those people who unlike Grady were not able to finally corner you. I have you cornered too, as you know, but I'll let you go free if you speak up for all those about whom you've been silent. Those folks are your burden. You can make a very serious difference in Scientology if you were to champion the cause of the SPs, especially the vulnerable, weak, defenseless and unable SPs.

Remember, wogs are your only out.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

>--Barbara

>DO NOT REPLY TO ABOVE ADDRESS; USE twain@scn.org

>





Was something about Bob for a change, right?

Page 1

=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology

Subject: Was something about Bob for a change, right?

From: armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong)

Date: Sat, 09 Oct 1999 13:38:59 GMT

-----  
On Fri, 08 Oct 1999 13:35:47 -0700, barb <bware@pacbell.net> wrote:

>Anonymous wrote:

>>

>> Barb, Martin, Gerry, et al, c'mon, admit it.

>> Bob uses offensive, degrading, and totally

>> non-PC language whenever he darn well feels like

>> it, and no matter who it hurts or offends.

Well no. I think you're talking here about what Bob communicated on  
irc, right?

Bob intended whatever he communicated to go to the people then on irc.  
He undoubtedly intended those communications directed explicitly to  
someone named in his communication to in some instances hurt or offend  
the individuals named. I think we can agree that the individuals to  
whom Bob directed his communications which were hurtful or offensive  
have themselves on one or more occasions directed communications to  
Bob which were hurtful or offensive. That is neither here nor there,  
but your evidence does not logically lead to the conclusion that Bob  
uses the same language in any other circumstance or that he darn well  
feels like it therefore only when directing certain communications to  
the certain named people causing them hurt or offense.

Am I right in this? Did Diane take the communications which were  
intended for her or others on i.r.c and post them to a.r.s.?

It seems to me that it was, since this is important to you, Diane who  
really didn't care who was hurt or offended with Bob's words. You must  
agree that she wanted to hurt or offend Bob for sure by posting his  
words. That worked, right? And Bob's friends, they get to be hurt or  
offended, right? In fact they're being hurt or offended right now  
aren't they. That's your job, right? And Bob's enemies, boy, now they  
have the final item in the necessary long list of hurts or offenses.

000304

Was something about Bob for a change, right?

Page 2

But I'm always a little hurt, no matter how happy I really am, when I'm named for a little hurt or offense by one CLameleon or another. I am the Gerry you've named up there, right? And if I, having been named, defend myself, it proves your attack's justification and efficacy.

>>

>Agreed. Now so what?

>

>> That's such a no-brainer it seems silly to say it.

>>

>> Martin, your thing with Rebecca Hartong about how  
>> she should "prove" her opinions is ridiculous. Why.  
>> you don't even SUGGEST that Bob should back up ANY  
>> of his OSA WHORE allegations (starting with the first  
>> one and going on thru the latest, which I believe  
>> is Karl Kluge) with any sort of "facts"! This is  
>> illogical.

Heh. Did you read the OSA whore Vicki Aznaran docs. posted, thank you, by Bob Minton?

Go ahead. Tell us Vicki wasn't and isn't an OSA whore? She may say she was an unwilling whore. But what whore wouldn't? And tell us David Kluge -- not Karl Kluge, goofy -- isn't once and always an OSA whore. And Dan Sherman, are you going to tell me Sherman, isn't an OSA word whore. And Mike Rinder, just tell us Rinder isn't an OSA whore?

And you, how about you, are you an OSA whore? And I'd like to see Laura Terepin's lips say, "No, Gerry, I'm not an OSA whore."

>>

>> Bob is

<snip Bob poem for later grading>

>> Ergo,

<and snip of an attack, posted to hurt or offend no matter who reads

000305





=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology

Subject: Enzo on the other hand (was Re: Gerry whines. Was, "CAN's Nancy O'Meara = C\$T Treasurer. And that ain't all. (was CAN's Bagley whines...)"

From: armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong)

Date: Sat, 09 Oct 1999 18:03:07 GMT

-----  
On Thu, 7 Oct 1999 00:13:25 +0200, "Enzo Piccone" <enzo@hermes.it>  
wrote:

>

>gerry armstrong <armstrong@dowco.com> wrote in message

>news:37fb96ee.20741822@news.dowco.com...

>

>snip

>

>: Start quote.

>:

>: FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

>:

>: Contact: Nancy O'Meara

>: Church of Scientology International

>: 213-960-3500

>:

>: OR: Andrew Wilson

>: Wilson, Ryan & Campilongo

>: 415-391-3900

>:

>: JUDGE ORDERS MARIN COUNTY MAN TO PAY CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY  
\$100,000 IN

>: DAMAGES

>:

>: FINES HIM AND HIS LAWYER FOR BAD FAITH TACTICS

>:

>: Marin County -- Judge Gary Thomas of the Marin County Superior

>: Court ordered Gerald Armstrong of San Anselmo to pay the plaintiff,

>: the Church of Scientology International \$100,000 in damages for

>: breaking provisions of a 1986 settlement agreement he signed with the

>: Church. The ruling, issued Friday, January 27, also sanctioned

>: Armstrong and his lawyer, Ford Greene also of San Anselmo, for

>: engaging in "bad faith" litigation and fined them \$700.

>:

>: This is the latest in a string of legal wins for the Church

>: against Armstrong who has been in and out court since he stole more  
>: than 10,000 documents from the Church in 1982 including over 5,000  
>: papers of Scientology founder L. Ron Hubbard.

>:

>: In the agreement he signed in 1986 Armstrong promised to  
>: refrain from spreading falsehoods about the Church. According to  
>: documents filed in this case, Armstrong is accused of having knowingly  
>: violated that agreement on a number of occasions as early as 1991. The  
>: Church sued in 1992 after Armstrong repeatedly refused to abide by the  
>: 1992 contract he had signed. Judge Thomas' ruling was based on  
>: documents filed in support of the Church's charges and regarded two of  
>: the earliest reported breaches by Armstrong.

>:

>: The Church's lawyers, Andrew Wilson (San Francisco) and Laurie  
>: Bartilson (Los Angeles) call the judgement "a complete legal and moral  
>: victory. It sends a message that you can't ignore your contractual  
>: obligations on a whim and that there's a price to pay for breaking  
>: promises. We hope this ruling will give Mr. Armstrong a message he  
>: will heed."

>:

>: Armstrong conceivably faces more extensive liability in this  
>: litigation, as the Church has asserted 18 additional claims against  
>: him. These, too, arise out of his violations of the 1986 agreement  
>: according to the Church's lawsuit. The Church also has charged that  
>: Gerald Armstrong fraudulently transferred title to a house he owned in  
>: order to manufacture a poverty plea against the judgements now  
>: starting to be entered against him.

>:

>: -30-

>:

>: End quote.

>:

>: I sent the following letter in response.

>:

>: Start quote.

>:

>:

February 1, 1995



>: Nancy O'Meara  
>: Church of Scientology International  
>: 6331 Hollywood Boulevard, Suite 1200  
>: Los Angeles, CA 90028  
>:  
>: Dear Ms. O'Meara:  
>:  
>: I am in receipt of your press release entitled "Judge Orders  
>: Marin Man to Pay Church of Scientology \$100,000 in Damages."  
>:  
>: Although there are many things in your press release which  
>: will be shown in due time to be untrue and malicious, there is  
>: one particularly mean fallacy that I want you to immediately  
>: correct in a follow-up writing to each and every person, company,  
>: organization or group to whom your release was transmitted.  
>:  
>: You claim at para. 3 that "In the agreement he signed in  
>: 1986 Armstrong promised to refrain from spreading falsehoods  
>: about the Church. According to documents filed in this case,  
>: Armstrong is accused of having knowingly violated that agreement  
>: on a number of occasions as early as 1991."  
>:  
>: The "agreement" does not contain a promise to refrain from  
>: spreading falsehoods about Scientology. I have never spread  
>: falsehoods about Scientology, but have told the truth, so there  
>: are no falsehoods to refrain from spreading.  
>:  
>: The reason I will continue to tell the truth is stated in my  
>: declaration which accompanies this letter. It is because I filed  
>: this declaration late, and for no other reason, that Judge Thomas  
>: assessed sanctions against me.  
>:  
>: What Scientology is doing with me is suppressive, and  
>: threatening to justice, wisdom and innocent people everywhere. I  
>: will continue to stand my ground and I refuse to be suppressed.  
>:  
>: I trust you will read these materials, and welcome your  
>: response. As long as I breathe I will continue to do what I see  
>: as God's will, and continue to bring Scientology's evil nature to  
>: the light of truth.



>:

>: I accept the opportunity to be the target of your fair game  
>: policy and so bring it and your organization's secret dark core  
>: closer to their end.

>:

>: Please correct your press release.

>:

>: Yours sincerely,

>: Gerald Armstrong

>: 715 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard

>: San Anselmo, CA 94960

>: (415)456-8450

>: cc: Media

>:

>: End quote.

>:

>: Scientology then filed a motion for a permanent injunction based in  
>: part on my response to O'Meara.

>:

>: To Gert, Hubbard's Amigo, Mike Smith and other Scientologists posting  
>: here: Do you believe it is a. right, b. ethical, c. just, or d. in  
>: compliance with your organization's "creed," that Scientology  
>: spokespeople and agents may lie about me, and I may not in response,  
>: except by breaching your "contract" and being judicially punished  
>: therefor, tell the truth to correct such lies?

>

>: Gerry Armstrong

>

>:snip

>

>My understanding of settlements is that each of the parties agrees to  
>get something and to give up something in terms of whatever it may be  
>after in the litigation being settled.

Your understanding is limited, but those can be factors. The  
\$cientology cult insists that it got something that can't be gotten,  
and that it gave up what it refuses to let go of. \$cientology is  
actually terrible at settling litigation; but that is because its  
lawyers and their handlers -- the Miscavige regime -- have an interest  
in not settling. My case with \$cientology is a perfect example.

Scientology --- the Miscavige regime and the lawyers -- acted after "settlement," and continues to act, to insure there could be no settlement.

A settlement condition must be legal. Since Scientology's conditions of "silence" are obstructive of justice, to say nothing of being against public policy and violative of the guarantees of freedom of speech and religion and from slavery, they are illegal.

>

>Unless I'm mistaken, part of your settlement agreement included the C of  
>S giving you several hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Scientology paid me monetarily to "settle" my lawsuit against it for its years of fraud and fair game.

>

>When you decided to violate this settlement, did you also make  
>arrangements to give this money back?

Scientology decided to violate the "settlement." I could never "release" Scientology for its future crimes or torts. And I never agreed to be for Scientology, DM and his thug lawyers and others a defenseless punching bag. To do would be unsafe, discourteous and stupid.

And I did indeed make the offer to Scientology -- ask O\$A whore Mike Rinder -- to have everything revert back to before the settlement. That would mean that my lawsuit would get tried, that the Hubbard papers would all be returned to court and available for the trying of my case, that all my attorneys and witnesses would be released from gag orders, that all of their evidence would be returned for my trial against Scientology, and I would return the money they gave me to settle my case. Rinder refused my offer.

>

>Or was this not part of "God's will" as you understand it?

Well, I think God's Will is as observable as it ever was. God is involved in justice and law and Scientology and its efforts to subvert



justice and law. It is not God's Will, although you may agrue, that people be suppressed, threatened, silenced, black PRed, fair gamed or annihilated by the ungodly, false religion \$cientology..

But tell me, Enzo, do you agree with \$cientology's efforts to silence me when the organization itself -- the Miscavige regime -- publishes black PR on me?

Do you, Enzo, agree that what \$cientology is trying to do through the US Court system is inviolation of its own creed?

Do you, Enzo, agree that \$cientology should spend its members' money on attempting to silence me?

To silence other critics?

Why don't you speak out on behalf of all the people \$cientology is trying to silence?

Don't \$cientology's efforts to silence people judicially and extrajudicially turn your \$cientologist's stomach?

The injunction against me in California will be struck down. \$cientology is on the wrong side of this issue; although the right side if they want to be seen as unrepentant persecutors and civil rights destroyers. Why don't you at least among \$cientologists come down on the right side?

You won't make much of a difference going along with \$cientology's efforts to suppress free speech and free speech practitioners. But you sure could make a difference if you took up the cause on behalf of all those people suppressed and silenced. Why don't you join me in this worthy task?

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

>E

>--

>Note: My correct e-mail address omits the "h" in enzo@hermes.it.





=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: Ask A Clam  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong)  
Date: Tue, 12 Oct 1999 21:46:49 GMT  
-----

On Tue, 12 Oct 1999 11:18:53 -0700, Don NOTs <wkohler@gmx.de> wrote:

>Hi Ess Peas,

>

>I've found a wonderful new site where one can ask experts questions on

>a variety of subjects. The following people are volunteer 'experts' on

>\$cientology:

>

>Greg Churilov

><http://www.allexperts.com/displayExpert.asp?Expert=4811&Category=949>

>

>Lynn Farny

><http://www.allexperts.com/displayExpert.asp?Expert=5255&Category=949>

This is cool. Lynn Farny at least is an O\$A whore. I don't know the other people.

It will be great to ask Farny questions. I have a couple of days of Farny's deposition in \$cientology v. Armstrong. He sure pretended to be anything but an expert in that depo/

(c) Gerry Armstrong

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

>Lynne Sagner

><http://www.allexperts.com/displayExpert.asp?Expert=5475&Category=949>

>

>There appears to be room for a expert critic of Scientology on the main

>page, <http://www.allexperts.com/getExpert.asp?Category=949> .

>

>Who's volunteering?





=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: The Sword of Excalibur  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong)  
Date: Tue, 12 Oct 1999 21:52:04 GMT  
-----

On Tue, 12 Oct 1999 19:35:51 +0200, Ralph Hilton  
<ralph@scientology.at> wrote:

>I'd be interested to hear from anyone who has first or second hand knowledge  
>rearding the unpublished book "Excalibur"

I read a couple of manuscript versions. I've written some about it,  
and will dig it up for you and add any other recollections.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>  
>I'll put up a web page about it.  
>  
>  
>--  
>  
>Ralph Hilton  
><http://Ralph.Hilton.org>  
>Freezone International: <http://www.fzint.org>



=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: An apology concerning Clearwater  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong)  
Date: Mon, 01 Nov 1999 17:55:31 GMT  
-----

On Mon, 01 Nov 1999 15:05:02 GMT, bob@minton.org (Bob Minton) wrote:

>-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----

>Hash: SHA1

>

>I made yet another mistake last night and allowed a group of  
>scientologists who had been harassing and confronting me from the  
>moment I walked off the plane yesterday to bait me into a stupid  
>response around 11:00 pm on Halloween in front of the Fort Harrison.

Well, good timing anyway.

>While attempting to call the police and in the process of crossing  
>the street to do so in private a certain scieno decided I was to have  
>no privacy and I responded in a way that the police considered  
>inappropriate on the video replay (my video).

Well, we pray that the \$cientologist is okay.

Ok, Bob, I'm convinced. You're \*not\* an OSA agent.

>That response landed me  
>in the Pinellas County Jail for a couple of hours in the wee hours of  
>the morning on a misdemeanor battery charge.

Fight any restraining order sought.

>

>I would like to apologize for any untowards grief that may befall  
>anyone here as a result of their friendship towards me or implicit  
>association with me by virtue of being opposed to scientology's  
>harassive and abusive tactics as well as their utter hypocrisy and  
>violation of people's civil and human rights.



We'll get over our grief, but probably won't get over our friendship.

> I am not the first  
> person to go to jail by being willing to stand up to a bigoted  
> organization who stomps on the civil and human rights of its members  
> and the public at large. I am also not the stupidest to do that.  
> However, once again, I regret having let down the side of the good  
> guys.

Me too.

>  
> Sincerely,  
>  
> Bob Minton  
>  
> P.S. For what its worth, the letter campaign in the last 10 days by  
> the anon cowards of scientology, the visit to my house in New  
> Hampshire by scientologists Saturday night and yesterday's events no  
> doubt shortened my fuse. :-(

Battery is almost never justified (\$cientologist Dan assaulted me on the October 16 Toronto picket) however the \$cientology campaign against you and their record of physical attacks will certainly extenuate the alleged offense.

Don't easily plead. Give this charge some time to do some good work. IANAL, as you know.

Enjoy the weather wherever you are.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>  
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----  
> Version: PGP Personal Privacy 6.5.1  
>  
> iQA/AwUBOB2ramgj/yM+AH/OEQJuZwCgvyQh85x5ihp36eL5XSt0abUWBoYAnR



=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: An apology concerning Clearwater  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (gerry armstrong)  
Date: Tue, 02 Nov 1999 00:28:56 GMT  
-----

On 1 Nov 1999 19:27:43 GMT, Keith Henson  
<hkhenson@netcom19.netcom.com> wrote:

>Bob Minton <bob@minton.org> wrote:

>

>snip

>

>> While attempting to call the police and in the process of crossing  
>> the street to do so in private a certain scieno decided I was to have  
>> no privacy and I responded in a way that the police considered  
>> inappropriate on the video replay (my video). That response landed me  
>> in the Pinellas County Jail for a couple of hours in the wee hours of  
>> the morning on a misdemeanor battery charge.

>

>Been there myself--twice. I was reviewing my arrest at the Shrine and two  
>weeks later at FOLA last night in connection with the latest Shrine picket  
>before I heard of this. I was arrested (the second time) partly on the  
>basis of assault for having bitten Edwin Richardson--who had stuck his arm  
>in my mouth from behind me trying to get a choke hold. I was encumbered  
>at the time with a picket sign and a large video camera.

>

>It is the price we pay for putting our bodies on the line to control this  
>deadly parasite on our democratic civilization.

>

>snip

>

>> P.S. For what its worth, the letter campaign in the last 10 days by  
>> the anon cowards of scientology, the visit to my house in New  
>> Hampshire by scientologists Saturday night and yesterday's events no  
>> doubt shortened my fuse. :-(

>

>It may get a lot worse before it gets better.

As long as the Miscavige regime can get other people to do their dirty



work it will only get so bad, because pretty well all the people doing the regime's dirty work are basically good. Except for the lawyers and PIs naturally because they are part of the regime.

When there are no more basically good people to do Miscavige and his cronies' dirty work, there will be a shift, because Miscavige and his cronies are not basically good. This could happen any time, so folks, let's be extra special careful out there.

> On the other hand, an  
>awful lot of scientologists who have been in contact with us don't seem to  
>be in scientology any more.

Getting down to the not so basically good.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>  
>Keith Henson  
>



=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: All quiet on the global front?  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)  
Date: Sat, 06 Nov 1999 19:52:33 GMT  
Message-ID: <38248681.3732918@news.dowco.com>  
-----

Do you get the idea every once in a while, this being one of those  
whiles, that the regime is at a loss for words?

It wouldn't take much. Just one O\$A A.R.S.Handling Department Section  
Head (R) saying, "It isn't working," would send DM into a tailspin.  
Which is the final moment of an already dwindling spiral.

All the attacks, all the rhetoric, all the lies, all the money, all  
the hours, all the lawyers, all the money for lawyers' hours, isn't  
working,

They've said it all. They've dug up all the "dirt" on Paulette Cooper,  
Mike Flynn, Lawrence, Dennis, Mayo, the IRS, the FBI, Interpol,  
Vaughn, Ford, Graham, Grady, Keith, Stacy, Bob, Jesse and me, and a  
million other people. And it's all come to this. It didn't work.  
There's nothing more that can be said; and even if there were  
something more it still wouldn't work.

Scientology's massive investment in black PR tech is a complete  
failure. That alone, coupled with the Miscavige regime's refusal to  
acknowledge black PR's complete failure, is enough to render  
Scientology -- the subject and organization -- a complete failure.

Anything worth engaging in black PR to save isn't worth saving.

(c) Gerry Armstrong





Good luck Monday Bob

Page 1

=====

Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology

Subject: Good luck Monday Bob

From: armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)

Date: Mon, 29 Nov 1999 06:57:48 GMT

Message-ID: <3842239c.4636982@news.dowco.com>

-----

In these matters, if the judge is fair you win.

All we're after is fairness. Scientology is after unfairness. If it's a fair outcome, Scientology loses.

If the Miscavige regime were smart, they'd seek fairness rather than unfairness. Then they wouldn't be such continual losers.

Good luck.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

000319





=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: Washington Post article is superb  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)  
Date: Wed, 01 Dec 1999 06:35:28 GMT  
Message-ID: <3844c11a.1568291@news.dowco.com>  
-----

On Tue, 30 Nov 1999 06:30:48 -0500, "M. C. DiPietra"  
<mdipietra@earthlink.net> wrote:

>

>-----

>In article <3842d97b.2868114@news2.lightlink.com>,  
>Rob\_Clark@justice.com (Rob Clark) wrote:

>

>

>>On 28 Nov 1999 20:50:57 GMT, jimdbb@aol.com (JimDBB) wrote:

>>

>>>"John Travolta's Alien Notion" by

>>>Richard Leiby in the Sunday Washington Post is beautifully written.

>>

>>>Go buy a copy of the Post or go to www.Washingtonpost.com for a good

>>printout

>>>copy.

>>

>>>Leiby will go right to the top of scientology's 'enemies' list. I

>>officially

>>>ask the ARSCC to appoint Richard Leiby an Honorary SP status.

>>

>>>JImDBB

>>

>>Leiby has been on the top of the SP Journalist list for quite some  
>>time. You might recall he was sued along with Arnie Lerma for  
>>covering the exposure of the OT levels. Judge Brinkema threw out the  
>>suit, deplored the motivation for it, and ordered the nut-cult to pay  
>>legal costs for Leiby and the Washington Post.

>>

>>Leiby has been covering the cult since at least 1994 and has received  
>>a lot of harassment and bullshit as a result.

>>

>>rob

>

>I believe Leiby used to work for the Clearwater \_Sun\_, when it

>still

>existed, before it became a target for Scientology in Operation

>Tricycle,

>and afterward. He knows a \*lot\* about Scientology.

I think he started at the Sun in 1977, but that could be wrong. Then he covered the trials of the GO 11. And has clearly kept his hand in the Scientology controversy for the Washington Post right up to PT.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

>

>---

>M.C.DiPietra <mdipietra@earthlink.net>, SP4

>"Hell, if you understood everything I say,

>you'd be me!" -Miles Davis

>



=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology

Subject: For Mark Regent (was "Trust" Seminar a Dismal Failure)

From: armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)

Date: Thu, 09 Dec 1999 21:29:24 GMT

Message-ID: <38501ef1.25546740@news.dowco.com>

-----  
On Sun, 05 Dec 1999 00:25:11 GMT, mark\_regent@my-deja.com wrote:

>More from Florida:

>

>I heard from several Scientologists in Clearwater and, just as  
>predicted, there was a grand total of 1 resident who could be  
>identified as actually from Clearwater who was not part of the  
>picketing group which showed up for the anti-religious seminar put  
>on by the "Trust" at the Holiday Inn.

You're wrong here, Mark. But first let me welcome you to a.r.s. I just got back from Clearwater myself and it's good to find someone from the \$cientology organization with whom I've never communicated.

The Lisa McPherson Trust (isn't that a great name?) did not put on the conference, although a number of people connected with the Trust were speakers and participants.

The discussion was not anti-religious in nature at all. Obviously, if you're telling the truth then the several \$cientologists in Clearwater are lying to you. That's why we, \$cientology's opposition, oppose \$cientology. Because it leads to endless lying. Now just think, you can end the cycle of endless lying just by telling the truth: that the seminar as you call it was not even slightly anti-religious.

Go ahead, give it a try. Tell the truth.

>

>In short it was a dismal failure. The seminar ended up being  
>Grady, Dandar and Hassan lecturing to themselves.

Do you know what. I was very moved and in fact honored to listen to each of the speakers, and in fact to the people asking questions.



It was a bigger success than 10 thousand Scientologists in tuxedos and evening gowns listening to DM go off with his fireworks. All that flash and pomp is the dismal failure. The Clearwater 1999 Conference in its humble success proved Scientology a dismal failure. Next time you cheer L. Ron Hubbard three or ten times at the next big event, think about it.

>

>I guess the "Trust" hasn't realized that they look and behave like  
>a bunch of brown shirt hooligans coming in from out of town,  
>insulting people, trying to cause trouble, attempting to create  
>hatred and intolerance in an otherwise harmonious community.

Ah, so you're a Clearwater Scientologist? How nice to have such a spokesperson.

A community in which harmony is "achieved" by lies, and disharmony is suppressed by threat, is not an harmonious community. Until your organization opens up all its dark rooms and hiding places, and comes clean about its lies, threats and other unhealthy and dangerous activities, it will live in disharmony. The protesters who come to Clearwater are the people who are seeking an end to the disharmony. The heart of Scientology is most disharmonious.

>

>People in Clearwater aren't stupid and don't need a bunch of  
>outsiders coming in and disrupting their lives and trying to tell  
>them what to think.

Then you must admit that back in 1975 people in Clearwater also weren't stupid and also didn't need a bunch of outsiders coming in and disrupting their lives and trying to tell them what to think. And you know what, Hubbard and his regime in fact did think people in Clearwater are stupid. And Miscavige and his regime continue to think people in Clearwater are stupid, and the regime does disrupt their lives and does tell them what to think.

>

>The churches in Clearwater practice tolerance of each other and

>it rubs people the wrong way when the obvious purpose for the  
>picketers coming to town is to harass other members of the  
>community - because they happen to be Scientologists.

The protestors come to town to protest the Miscavige regime which is responsible for this period of black Scientology. We want to get this message to any Scientologist who will listen. You're here, so listen. We're saying that your regime leaders, DM and his pseudozealots, are responsible for all this black Scientology.

Are you saying that identifying DM as the person behind all the black Scientology is a message that we shouldn't try to get inside to the good Scientologists being robbed, cheated, lied to and destroyed by the black Scientologists using black Scientology? Which side are you on? Surely you don't defend the Miscavige regime's proliferation of black Scientology!

>  
>No amount of Bob's money can put a different face on the "Trust's"  
>>true purpose which is the destruction of Scientology, a religion to  
>which numerous members of the Clearwater community belong.

Ah, I see. That's all that Scientology's left with. The nazis calling jews nazis.

But listen, just so there's no doubt, Mark, because you're claiming to know the true purpose of the Lisa McPherson Trust, it is appropriate to call you a liar. The Trust wants only to end black Scientology. And you and every Scientologist and every thinking wog should want to end black Scientology too. You don't of course, because you are a defender and promoter of black Scientology. You work for black Scientology and its dark goals. I'll bet you're on the black Scientology payroll. You should get your ethics in, and tell DM and his black Scientologist bullies to take their black tech, black art and black bags and get the hell out of Scientology.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>  
> mark\_regent@my-deja.com







=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: Dorothy!  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)  
Date: Sat, 25 Dec 1999 01:18:32 GMT  
Message-ID: <38641ace.679239@news.dowco.com>  
-----

On Fri, 24 Dec 1999 23:23:42 GMT, Dorothy West  
<dorothy\_west@my-deja.com> wrote:

>In article <385E930E.CF03FE2F@ScapeGoat.COM>,  
> FRice@ScapeGoat.COM wrote:  
>> ChildOfGod wrote:  
>>  
>> > In article <83ke5q\$9eu\$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, dorothy\_west@my-deja.com  
>says...  
>> > Bob having sympathy for Lisa?

Out of the blue, right? Nothing going on, and all of a sudden you dump  
out this black PR of Bob.

What was Bob doing?

Have you ever talked to Bob?

But really, isn't it a bit creepy to accuse Bob of not having  
sympathy, when sympathy is something you try to strip from  
\$cientologists in \$cientology. Sympathy is attacked by Hubbard as an  
extremely aberrated point on your emotional tone scale. \$cientologists  
are audited on sympathy. How terribly creepy that you attack a wog for  
not having the very thing you despise and seek to eliminate in  
yourself.

>> Don't make me laugh.

Oh, but we do. Making \$cientologists laugh is divine therapy.

>>Your answer

>clearly

>> > shows that you do not understand the man. He could never afford

Re: Dorothy!

Page 2

>such a

>> >>feeling as sympathy. Let me try to explain it to you.

Oh, please do. I'm all ears. It's Christmas Eve.

>> >>Dorothy

>> >

>> > You are sadly mistaken about Bob Minton, Dorothy.

>> > And even sadder is that you are spreading ill will towards Bob.

>> > I feel sorry for you. Spreading lies is evil, Dorothy.

>> > Remember: As ye sow, so shall ye reap.

>> > Child

>>

>> His name isn't Dorothy. Send me an e-mail and I'll let you know who  
>he is.

>

>E-mail sent. Awaiting reply.

>

>Dorothy :)

I'll go with the Dorothy handle. Tell us about how L. Ron Hubbard  
afforded all those emotional tones such as sympathy.

Merry Christmas.

Peace on earth and good will to all Wogs (R) and \$cientologists.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

>

>

>Sent via Deja.com <http://www.deja.com/>

>Before you buy.

000326





=====

From: armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)

Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology

Subject: Re: Warner Brothers and the CoS?

Date: Thu, 30 Dec 1999 17:23:12 GMT

Message-ID: <386b9347.8655464@news.dowco.com>

References: <84f1i9\$41u\$1@nnrp1.deja.com> <84f5jg\$14b9@edrn.newsguy.com>  
<84f75n\$16da@edrn.newsguy.com>

X-Newsreader: Forte Free Agent 1.11/32.235

NNTP-Posting-Host: tchl095.chw.dowco.com

X-Trace: 30 Dec 1999 09:24:02 -0800, tchl095.chw.dowco.com

Lines: 92

Path:

newsmaster1.prod.itd.earthlink.net!nntp.earthlink.net!newsfeed1.earthlink.net!feeder.qis.  
net!newsfeed.direct.ca!news.vphos.net!tchl095.chw.dowco.com

Xref: nntp.earthlink.net alt.religion.scientology:1053997

-----

On 30 Dec 1999 01:03:51 -0800, Arnie Lerma <www.lermanet.com>  
<Arnie\_member@newsguy.com> wrote:

>In article <84f5jg\$14b9@edrn.newsguy.com>, Arnie says...

>>

>>In article <84f1i9\$41u\$1@nnrp1.deja.com>, gordylowe@my-deja.com says...

>>>

>>>Hello,

>>>

>>>I was wondering if any of the more knowledgeable people here could help  
>>>me out...

>>>

>>>Beyond the Battlefield Earth movie and the alledgedly Hubbard-written  
>>>Dive Bomber film, I was wondering if there is or has been any Warner  
>>>Bros./Scientology ties.

>>>

>>>Specifically, I was wondering if:

>>>\*any high-ranking Warner Bros. executives/bigshots (in the last 25-30  
>>>years) have been Scientologists.

>>>\*Scientology has been in a position to influence Warner Bros. in any  
>>>way during this time.

>>>

>>>Thank you in advance for anything you can tell me. Feel free to reply

>>>via email.

>

> I only have some very old data

>

> Cass Warner the heir to the original Warner Bros fortune

I heard she was an heir, not the heir, and that her connection to Warner Brothers the film makers was small, but I really have no actual knowledge of this.

- > married a guy named Hauser and was known as Cass Hauser
- > This fellow, [ who is not part of the question ] had a stage
- > name I think it was "Wings Livingwrite" phonetic spelling
- > I never saw the names spelled.. Im typing it from how it sounded.
- > "Howzir" Both of them were active Scientologists at this time
- > I was told back then that this girls claim to fame was
- > as the heir to "the warner brothers fortune".. The year was 1971, 2 or 3
- > I have no idea whether they are still in.

Cass Warner later married, I believe, Glen Pool (sp?), which was a little weird because Pool, or Poole, was in the Sea Org, a contemporary of mine in the \$O. I don't recall any details beyond this, although I have observed from I think Scientology's publications that Cass Warner has continued to be connected to the organization.

I remember one time when Hubbard got the idea that Glen was not riding someone or something hard enough ("product officering") and issued an ethics order accusing him of dramatizing his name. But Hubbard was nuts.

I suppose you could check the Scientology-connected movies (Cruise, Travolta, against Warner productions.

I stayed for a couple of days at a home owned, I was told, by the Hausers, in Santa Barbara in 1975, while on leave from the \$O, along with Heber and Yvonne Jentzsch and Yvonne's daughter, Terri, then my wife.

(c) Gerry Armstrong





=====  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)

Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology

Subject: Re: Background for Senate Resolution 230 IS

Date: Thu, 30 Dec 1999 17:29:12 GMT

Message-ID: <386b958a.9234734@news.dowco.com>

References: <84fm1a\$io5@netaxs.com>

X-Newsreader: Forte Free Agent 1.11/32.235

NNTP-Posting-Host: tchl095.chw.dowco.com

X-Trace: 30 Dec 1999 09:30:03 -0800, tchl095.chw.dowco.com

Lines: 310

Path:

newsmaster1.prod.itd.earthlink.net!nntp.earthlink.net!newsfeed1.earthlink.net!newsfeed.d  
irect.ca!news.vphos.net!tchl095.chw.dowco.com

Xref: nntp.earthlink.net alt.religion.scientology:1053999

-----  
On 30 Dec 1999 13:17:30 GMT, rkeller@netaxs.com (Rod Keller) wrote:

>

>[ Article reposted from alt.support.ex-cult ]

>[ Author was attorney@nospam.inet-systems.net ]

>[ Posted on Thu, 30 Dec 1999 04:45:12 GMT ]

>

>The following is found in the Congressional Record and provides a

>background for the introduction of Senate Resolution 230 IS:

>

><http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/D?r106:1:./temp/~r1068jpZYe:e4104:>

>

>Text is as follows:

>

>Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to submit a resolution concerning

>religious discrimination in Germany with my colleague, the

>distinguished Senator from Louisiana, Ms. Landrieu. The resolution

>urges the German government to eliminate religious discrimination

>within its country because I believe, as a matter of general

>government policy, no religion or belief should be discriminated

>against. Anytime the government collects or allows businesses to

>collect and use information that marks an individual as being

>different, it is discriminatory and it is wrong. This is a human

>rights issue. An individual or a group should be allowed to worship in



>private without public repercussions.

>

>A letter sent to me from the Department of State in August, states

>'Wherever it may occur, discrimination against an individual or group

>is a fundamental human rights violation, and the United States

>government is still very concerned about incidents of discrimination

>in Germany.' The Department of State Human Rights Reports on Germany

>have disclosed discrimination based on religion or belief in Germany

>in such forms as: exclusion from government employment and political

>parties; the use of 'sect-filters' (required declarations that a

>person or company is not affiliated with a particular religious group)

>by government, businesses, sport clubs, and other organizations;

>government-approved boycotts and discrimination against businesses;

>and, the prevention of artists from performing or displaying their

>works.

>

>I also am aware of the possibilities of United States companies based

>in Germany being coerced by the German government to discriminate

>against American and other employees based on their beliefs. We have a

>number of German companies conducting business in the United States. I

>do not want to see these discriminatory practices imported to our

>country. This issue of government discrimination is not solely

>contained within the borders of Germany.

>

>The resolution is simple and straightforward. It urges the German

>government to enter into a constructive dialogue with minority groups

>subject to government discrimination based on religion or belief. The

>resolution also calls upon the president to assert the United States'

>concern to Germany regarding government discrimination based on

>religion or belief.

>

>If the goal of a world functioning under a flag of democratic freedom

>is to be realized, the leaders of the free world must set the example.

>Germany is a leader in the European and world communities. Germany

>also is a strong United States ally. It is my hope that the German

>government will allow its country men and women to be leaders of a

>free society where an individual's beliefs are the sole decision of

>the individual rather than a matter of state.

>



>Mr. President, I would like to submit for the Record a letter I sent  
>to the Department of State on July 16, 1999 as well as the Department  
>of State's response to my letter.

>

>The material follows:

>

>United States Senate,  
>Washington, DC, July 16, 1999.

>

>Hon. Marc Grossman,  
>Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, State Department,  
>Washington, DC.

>

>[Page: S14427] GPO's PDF

>Dear Mr. Grossman: Over the past six years there has been a steady  
>increase in the number of religious freedom violations in Germany.  
>These violations have been noted in the State Department Human Rights  
>Country Reports on Germany and the 1998 report of the State Department  
>Advisory Committee on Religious Freedom. They have also been a matter  
>of concern to various human rights groups. All of these reports have  
>described both government and private sector discrimination against  
>individuals and groups, including American citizens, because of their  
>religious beliefs.

>

>Last November, several of my colleagues in the Senate and I wrote to  
>Chancellor Schroeder to express our concerns about this discrimination  
>and the need for dialogue between the German Government and  
>representatives of various religious groups. When we finally received  
>a reply to our inquiry from the German Foreign Office in March, it was  
>accompanied with a copy of the 'Religious Freedom' section of the 1998  
>State Department Human Rights Report on Germany with a note stating  
>that the 1998 Report revised 'certain views found in former reports.'  
>We were quite disappointed that the Foreign Office reply largely  
>ignored our concerns. While I do not share the German view that the  
>1998 Human Rights Report signaled that the State Department is no  
>longer concerned with religious discrimination in Germany, I find the  
>German Government's perception of the Report troubling.

>

>One religious group in Germany that has been the subject of the State  
>Department reports is the Christian Community in Cologne (CCK), an



>1,100 member Church headed by an American, Pastor Terry Jones. The  
 >1998 Report stated that virtually no incidents of harassment,  
 >discrimination, or death threats have been directed at CCK members  
 >since 1992. However, I have seen statements from Pastor Jones, along  
 >with other reports and news stories that indicate that the CCK has  
 >been the subject of discrimination since 1992. Tax difficulties aside,  
 >the CCK has been subject to harassment by government 'sect'  
 >commissions, threats of violence, and members being denied jobs and  
 >child custody because of their Church affiliation. The sources of  
 >these reports include the 1998 Interim Report of the State Department  
 >Advisory Committee on Religious Freedom Abroad; an April 1998 CNN  
 >Worldview story; the testimony of a CCK representative at a September  
 >1997 hearing before the Commission on Security and Cooperation in  
 >Europe (CSCE); and a May 1997 Report from the British House of Lords.  
 >Also, in testimony before the CSCE in July 1998, a representative from  
 >the Center for the Study of New Religious Movements criticized Germany  
 >for police raids that have occurred against small, independent  
 >Pentacostal churches. The Universal Life Church has also suffered  
 >discrimination in Germany. Press reports indicate that members of this  
 >Christian Church lost their jobs, not because of any wrongdoing, but  
 >because of their commitment to their faith.

>  
 >Another minority group that has been subject to significant  
 >discrimination in Germany is the Church of Scientology and its  
 >members. The documentation of discrimination against both Americans  
 >and Germans based solely on their Church membership seems irrefutable.  
 >I especially find the growing governmental use and sponsorship of  
 >'sect-filters' disturbing. Nonetheless, in spite of all this evidence  
 >and documentation, the German Government seems to believe the State  
 >Department has revised its views as to the existence of religious  
 >discrimination in their country. I have also seen media reports that  
 >characterized the 1998 Report as effectively ending earlier State  
 >Department criticism of Germany for its treatment of Scientologists.

>  
 >I cannot believe these characterizations of the Human Rights Report  
 >are an accurate representation of the position of the State Department  
 >on these matters. Clearly, the matter of religious discrimination and  
 >persecution in Germany needs to be reviewed and the position of the  
 >State Department clarified. That review should include a thorough  
 >evaluation of the problem, the extent to which the German government



>is responsible for these actions, and a determination of the  
>appropriate response for these actions, and a determination of the  
>appropriate response of the United States Government to this serious  
>situation.

>

>As I mentioned earlier, the letter sent to Chancellor Schroeder by my  
>Senate colleagues and I expressed the belief that an open and direct  
>dialogue between the German Government and minority religious groups  
>was sorely needed. In particular, I am aware that the State Department  
>had undertaken efforts to establish such a dialogue between the German  
>Government and the Church of Scientology. I applaud this effort.  
>Unfortunately, I understand that the German Government has refused to  
>enter into any such dialogue. Is the State Department considering any  
>steps it can take to encourage such a discussion?

>

>Given Germany's strong commitment to democracy, I am troubled by the  
>continuing reports and the evidence of government sponsored  
>discrimination in Germany against minority religious groups. For  
>Germany to abide by its international treaty commitments it must  
>respect the beliefs of all religious groups. At whatever level it  
>occurs, it remains the responsibility of the German Federal Government  
>to ensure that the entire country complies with its international  
>human rights treaty obligations. This should especially be true when  
>American citizens are involved.

>

>While I commend the efforts of the State Department to address  
>discrimination in Germany based on religion or belief, it is very  
>important for your Human Rights Country Report on Germany to be  
>clarified so that the position of the State Department on this issue  
>is unmistakably clear. I hope to work with you to resolve these  
>important issues and look forward to your reply to my letter at your  
>earliest opportunity.

>

>Sincerely,

>

>Michael B. Enzi,  
>U.S. Senator.

>

>--

>



>U.S. Department of State,  
>Washington, DC, August 25, 1999.

>  
>Hon. Michael B. Enzi,  
>U.S. Senate.

>  
>Dear Senator Enzi: Thank you for your July 16 letter regarding  
>religious freedom violations in Germany and the State Department's  
>1998 Human Rights Report. I am responding on behalf of Assistant  
>Secretary Grossman. Your letter raises several important issues  
>concerning ongoing efforts at the State Department to work with German  
>officials and affected minority groups to end discrimination in  
>Germany based on religion or belief. Wherever it may occur,  
>discrimination against an individual or group is a fundamental human  
>rights violation, and the United States Government is still very  
>concerned about incidents of discrimination in Germany. As the past  
>six years of Human Rights Reports indicate, religious discrimination  
>in Germany continues to take place and the Department of State is  
>committed to addressing issues of religious intolerance.

>  
>We, too, were puzzled with characterizations of the 1998 Human Rights  
>Report as ending criticism of Germany. While we would rather devote  
>our time to working with the German government on ways to end  
>discrimination in Germany based on religion or belief, it is also very  
>important to express criticism and concern with ongoing German  
>discriminatory actions and policies. This critical review is one of  
>the primary purposes of the annual Human Rights Report. To interpret  
>the 1998 Report's greater inclusion of German government statements  
>attacking minority groups and rationalizing discriminatory acts and  
>policies as State Department agreement with such statements is wrong.

>  
>Perception of the report aside, we are particularly concerned with  
>growing use of sect filters in Germany which prevent a person from  
>practicing his or her profession or participating in public and  
>private fora, solely based on that person's religion or belief. This  
>clearly discriminatory practice is being used by the Federal Ministry  
>of Economics, state governments, private businesses and other  
>organizations in Germany. We have discussed with German state and  
>federal authorities the violation of individual rights posed by  
>sect-filters and will continue our efforts to end the use of such



>filters.

>

>On the subject of discrimination against the Evangelical churches in  
>Germany, specifically the Christian Community in Cologne (CGK), U.S.  
>Embassy personnel have met with two associate pastors of the CGK. We  
>have been unable to meet with Pastor Jones, the leader of the church  
>who testified before the Commission on Security and Cooperation in  
>Europe in 1997 about discrimination.

Did Pastor Jones get recalled to Flag?

>The two pastors interviewed did

>describe incidents of religious discrimination in child custody and  
>employment situations. However, until we are able to verify these  
>allegations of discrimination, the State Department is reluctant to  
>include such examples in an official report.

>

>Over the past year, State Department officials in Washington and  
>Germany have undertaken a determined effort to bring together  
>representatives of the Church of Scientology with representatives of  
>the German Federal Government to open a dialogue on issues of concern.  
>To our dismay, the German Government has refused to meet with  
>Scientology representatives. Regardless of what the German Government  
>thinks about the nature and philosophy of Scientology, refusal to  
>enter into a constructive dialogue is troubling. We will continue to  
>press the German Government to take this step.

And we will continue to press the United States to enter into a  
constructive dialogue about Scientology. It is the US refusal to enter  
into a constructive dialog which is troubling.

There is something very dark behind the State Department's activities,  
the IRS's activities, Congress's activities, and I'd bet  
intelligence's activities about and with Scientology. It isn't just  
stupidity.

>

>As your letter correctly states, Germany is obligated by various  
>international human rights treaties to respect the freedom of an  
>individual to worship alone or in community with other religious or

>beliefs acting in accordance with the dictates of his own conscience.

Oh, yes, and what \$cientologist has been prevented from worshipping alone or in community with other religious or beliefs acting in accordance with the dictates of his own conscience?

>And no matter at what level discrimination occurs, it is the  
>responsibility of the German Federal Government to ensure that the  
>entire country complies with its international human rights treaty  
>obligations. We look forward to working with you and other Members of  
>Congress to that end in Germany.

And we look forward to the US being willing to work with people persecuted by the \$cientology organization on US soil and abroad.

>  
>I hope our response has addressed your concerns. Please do not  
>hesitate to contact us if you have further questions about this or any  
>other matter.

Thank you for the invitation.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>  
>Sincerely,  
>  
>Barbara Larkin,  
>Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs.

>  
>\*\*\*\*\*  
>\*\*\*\*\*

>  
>  
>Sincerely,  
>Barry L. Hardy  
>attorney@nospam.inet-systems.net  
>Georgia State University  
>School of Law (1999)  
>[To send email, remove "nospam." from above email address]

>

>--

>Rod Keller / rkeller@voicenet.com / Irresponsible Publisher

>Black Hat #1 / Expert of the Toilet / CWPD Mouthpiece / Killer Rod

>The Lerma Apologist / Merchant of Chaos / Vision of Destruction

>Bigot of Mystery / OSA Patsy / Quasi-Scieno / Mental Bully





=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: Psychiatry Will Be Destroyed By the Year 2000 AD  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)  
Date: Fri, 31 Dec 1999 23:49:28 GMT  
Message-ID: <386d379c.2592667@news.dowco.com>  
-----

On Fri, 31 Dec 1999 16:19:38 -0500, "Rebecca Hartong"  
<Praetorian@mgfairfax.rr.com> wrote:

>  
><mark\_regent@my-deja.com> wrote in message  
>news:84ind1\$3f\$1@nnrp1.deja.com...  
>> In article <386C4531.6656@ao.net>,  
>  
>> I would say the killing of 100,000 people a year is pretty serious. Not  
>> all those are being treated by the psychs obviously, but the problem  
>> exists there because psych drugs are some of the biggest sellers and  
>> are pushed heavily by the psych industry.  
>  
>Well, that shouldn't be a problem, should it? I mean... you guys keep  
>telling us how the number of doctors who choose to become psychiatrists is  
>in a major decline. If that's so, there shouldn't be anything to worry  
>about.  
>  
>> Thus, we see the wackos on  
>> psych drugs or recently on them and suffering from side effects going  
>> into schools and blowing people away.  
>  
>Psych drugs have only been widely used for maybe 30 years. FBI studies,  
>however, tell us that in the United States violent crime has in fact rather  
>steadily \*decreased\* over the past 30 years. Not only that, studies also  
>confirm that the great majority of violent crime is committed by people who  
>have never been diagnosed or treated for a mental illness. How do you  
>account for that, Mark?  
>  
>The medical specialty of psychiatry itself has only been around for less  
>than 200 years and yet history tells us that people have been going on  
>murderous rampages since before people began even writing these things down.  
>What caused people to do these terrible things-- \*before\* psychiatry or



>psych drugs were even around, Mark?

Don't you believe it Rebecca. Hubbard states that psychs have always been around. They are the whole track murderers behind all of history's murderous rampages. Just ask a \$cientologist. Oh, hell, wait til the movie comes out.

>

>> It is a serious problem don't you think?

>

>I find an even more serious problem to be the alarmingly widespread dearth  
>of critical thinking skills among people--people like yourself,  
>Mark\_Regent--who seem otherwise to have received some sort of formal  
>education.

Have you ever met an informally educated person? I mean everybody received some sort of formal education.

> Is it that there are truly more stupid people in the world than  
>there once were? Or is it, rather, that the Internet allows us to come into  
>contact with more fools than we might otherwise have the opportunity to  
>meet?

Actually, in the observation of more or less fools or foolishness, the cause, if anything other than God Himself can correctly be called a cause, is that we are, as a race, in pockets, in nations, in groups, and in individuals, exiting the Age of Stupidity (R) and entering the Age of Wisdom (R). Consequently, things which have been taken for granted or even viewed as wise, are being viewed as stupid. And more and more.

Intellect is a sort of sliding scale. Wisdom or stupidity is more clearcut. It's what you do with your intellect, your God-given smarts.

\$cientology works on the IQ, the sliding scale, without, I can personally confirm by my very slow mind, any success whatsoever. Then in the wisdom or stupidity choice, \$cientology directs its people, and chooses for them, in pretty well any situation, stupidity.



That's why I believe it is a thoroughly honorable thing to dismantle the Scientology organization and its "technology." It is an organization and technology which produces stupidity, and any more stupidity puts all of us at risk.

The alternative to Scientology is not another brand of Scientology, not something else to move the intellect a point or so along the IQ scale, but wisdom. I can say to every Scientologist with perfect confidence that what I'm saying is absolutely accurate, seek wisdom.

If you don't find wisdom in Hubbard's teachings and if you don't find wisdom in the people who run Scientology, then go elsewhere. No matter what you learn in Scientology, if you don't find wisdom, you will be doing something mighty stupid.

If you decide that you don't want wisdom but want to stay in Scientology, then at least know that's the choice you're making. Wisdom is free and takes no time at all. Scientology's costs are gargantuan and it eats up all your time. Wisdom works.(R) Make the wise choice.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

>> Shouldn't you do something  
>> about it? Maybe you should join CCHR's efforts to stop this sort of  
>> abuse.

>

>Of course there are abuses within the field of psychiatry-- just as there  
>are abuses within the fields of plumbing, car sales, and religious vocation  
>(including, need I mention, vocations involving the application of an  
>"applied religious philosophy"). I find, however, that law enforcement  
>agencies and the oversight committees of these professions generally do a  
>good job of containing these abuses. I also find that CCHR is less concerned  
>with simply identifying actual abuses within the field of psychiatry than it  
>is with wiping out the profession entirely. In that regard, CCHR is not only  
>short-sighted and ill-informed but also dishonest about its true goal.

>

>

>





=====  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: The LMT, Its Purpose & Problems  
Date: Fri, 31 Dec 1999 06:53:50 GMT  
Message-ID: <386c52fc.6389728@news.dowco.com>  
References: <386afb43.3544061@news.dowco.com>  
<19991230133007.03528.00000027@ng-fi1.aol.com>  
X-Newsreader: Forte Free Agent 1.11/32.235  
NNTP-Posting-Host: dial-238.pm1.chw.dowco.com  
X-Trace: 30 Dec 1999 22:54:42 -0800, dial-238.pm1.chw.dowco.com  
Lines: 256  
Path:  
newsmaster1.prod.itd.earthlink.net!nntp.earthlink.net!newsfeed1.earthlink.net!newsfeed.d  
irect.ca!news.vphos.net!dial-238.pm1.chw.dowco.com  
Xref: nntp.earthlink.net alt.religion.scientology:1054300  
-----

On 30 Dec 1999 18:30:07 GMT, ace614575216@aol.com (Ace614575216)  
wrote:

>armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)  
>wrote:  
>>  
>>My expert opinion is that Bob Minton has an excellent understanding of  
>>Scientology.  
>  
>You disqualify yourself as any kind of real "expert" if after reading the  
>Dorian stuff or even Minton's recent message to Flag S.O. you can't see that he  
>is clueless.

I won't read all of Dorian, although I do have an understanding of  
Dorian, an understanding which is clearly different from yours. But  
I'll go back and read Bob's message I think you're talking about.

Do you mean Bob's message of hope for the Sea Org of Scientology?

[Quote]

From: Bob Minton <bob@minton.org>



Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology

Subject: A message of hope for the Sea Org of Scientology

Date: Fri, 24 Dec 1999 12:25:03 -0500

Organization: The Lisa McPherson Trust, Inc., Clearwater, Florida

Lines: 80

Message-ID: <h0b76s4a0i8o1a273tqdkgeet9c5st6fs2@4ax.com>

Reply-To: bob@minton.org

NNTP-Posting-Host: p-956.newsdawg.com

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Newsreader: Forte Agent 1.7/32.534

Path:

news.vphos.net!newsfeed.direct.ca!newsfeed.berkeley.edu!enews.sgi.com!pln-w!spln!extra.newsguy.com!newsp.newsguy.com!news1

Xref: ares.vphos.net alt.religion.scientology:1183015

Just close your eyes and remember back to happier times. Those times will come again. We of the Lisa McPherson Trust, will open our doors to you on January 6, 2000 at 33 N. Fort Harrison Ave., Clearwater, Florida 33757, Telephone: (727) 467-9335. We will be there to help you make those happier times return again to your life.

Now, read this and close your eyes and dream!

### A VISIT FROM ST. NICHOLAS

'Twas the NIGHT before Christmas, when all  
through the house  
Not a creature was stirring, not even a mouse;  
The stockings were hung by the chimney with care,  
In hopes that St. Nicholas soon would be there;  
The children were nestled all snug in their beds,  
While visions of sugar plums danced in their heads;  
And Mama in her 'kerchief, and I in my cap,  
Had just settled our brains for a long winter's nap;  
When out on the lawn there arose such a clatter,  
I sprang from the bed to see what was the matter.

AWAY TO THE WINDOW I flew like a flash,  
Tore open the shutters and threw up the sash.  
The moon on the breast of the new?fallen snow  
Gave the luster of mid?day to objects below,  
When what to my wondering eyes should appear  
But a miniature sleigh, and eight tiny reindeer,  
With a little old driver, so lively and quick,  
I knew in a moment it must be St. Nick.

MORE RAPID THAN EAGLES his courses they came,  
And he whistled, and shouted, and called them by name:  
"Now, Dasher! now, Dancer! now, Prancer and Vixen!  
On Comet! on, Cupid! on, Donner and Blitzen!  
To the top of the porch! to the top of the wall!  
Now dash away! dash away! dash away all!"  
As dry leaves that before the wild hurricane fly,  
When they meet with an obstacle, mount to the sky,  
So up to the house?top the courses they flew,  
With the sleigh full of toys, and St. Nicholas too.  
And then, in a twinkling, I heard on the roof  
The prancing and pawing of each little hoof?

AS I DREW IN MY HEAD and was turning around,  
Down the chimney St. Nicholas came with a bound.  
He was dressed all in fur from his head to his foot,  
And his clothes were all tarnished with ashes and soot;  
A bundle of toys he had flung on his back,  
And he looked like a peddler just opening his pack.  
His eyes? how they twinkled! his dimples how merry!  
His cheeks were like roses, his nose like a cherry!  
His droll little mouth was drawn up like a bow,  
And the beard of his chin was as white as the snow;  
The stump of a pipe he held tight in his teeth,  
And the smoke it encircled his head like a wreath;  
He had a broad face and a round little belly,  
That shook when he laughed, like a bowlful of jelly.  
He was chubby and plump, a right jolly old elf,  
And I laughed when I saw him, in spite of myself;



A WINK OF HIS EYE and a twist of his head,  
Soon gave me to know I had nothing to dread;  
He spoke not a word, but went straight to his work,  
And filled all the stockings; then turned with a jerk,  
And laying his finger aside of his nose,  
And giving a nod, up the chimney he rose;  
He sprang to his sleigh, to his team gave a whistle,  
And away they all flew like the down of a thistle.  
But I heard him exclaim, ere he drove out of sight,  
"Happy Christmas to all, and to all a good night. "

Clement Clarke Moore, 1822

Bob Minton,

"Keeping Scientology Working" OverTime

[End Quote]

That's funny. I thought it was an a.r.s. classic. A masterpiece,  
which, as I responded at the time, gave me rushes. Do they call them  
rushes?

>

>My suspicion is that you underestimate Bob Minton. I believe that although he  
>is clueless re: Scientology, he is a very smart guy, in fact a lot smarter than  
>you.

Oh, I know, and have always known that Bob is a lot smarter than I am.  
But now you tell me you suspect that I'm underestimating him. Should I  
feel bad or good?

Actually I feel blessed. And now that I've got your attention, where  
is blessed on the tone scale?

Bob is not only a lot smarter than I am, he's a lot more able and a  
lot more on-purpose. I, on the other hand, am luckier, and I'm faster  
on my feet. So things balance out. We don't know who is the better  
dancer, but Bob is the better shot, and I do a better L. Ron Hubbard.



The fact is that I am an expert in the subject of Scientology, particularly the organization's basic philosophy and policy of fair game. I have been recognized by the court as an expert and I have been retained in legal proceedings as an expert. I have testified over 60 days in depositions or in trials in over 20 Scientology-related cases and have drafted and executed perhaps 60 declarations or affidavits providing my knowledge, experiences and expert opinions.

May I ask you to provide a sample of the expert statements you've made on the subject of Scientology so that this forum can make an informed comparison.

The fact is that Bob is not an expert in Scientology in the same way that I am an expert in the subject. Nevertheless, Bob, being indeed a lot smarter than me, is very smart about the subject of Scientology. He is also a lot smarter than me in a number of other areas. I was given the burden almost at birth of being an expert in, above all else, nothing. This expertise I discovered, quite late in life actually, dovetailed rather percisely with my acquired expertise in Scientology.

It isn't at all whether Bob is smarter than me. You'd love to make that an issue. The reality is not Bob vs. Gerry, but Bob plus Gerry. That's what you can't confront. You haven't got a snowball's chance of dividing the opposition, and what you and your bosses should do is sue for peace. Because it's worse, or better actually, than you imagined. Not only is it not Bob vs. Gerry but Bob plus Gerry, but it's Bob plus Gerry plus Stacy plus Jesse plus David plus Kim plus Mark plus Grady plus Keith plus Tilman plus Roland plus Roger plus Beverly plus Barbara plus Rox plus Gregg plus Alan plus Arnie plus Martin plus a host of other good people all sharper or duller than Bob or me.

>Certainly smart enough to have "your number."

604-795-5852. There, now you're just as smart as Bob.

There's been this song by the other Bob running through my mind for months, which I've quoted on occasion, although, as it turns out, incorrectly, because in the human arena it pretty well says it all.

It's a mantram for Scientologists.

"I'm just average, common too.  
I'm just like him, and the same as you.  
I'm everybody's brother and son.  
I ain't different than anyone.  
Ain't no use to talk to me.  
It's just the same as talkin' to you."

"I Shall Be Free No.10"

Bob Dylan

Bob Minton, by the way, sent me this cool computer, and I can now listen to all these philosophers like Dylan. Me sending Bob a computer makes no sense at all, but Bob sending me one makes all the sense in the world. Do you see how that works?

>

>There are just too many out-points here.

Too many for whom? If there was an OT there he wouldn't complain that there are too many outpoints. There are actually no outpoints, so you can imagine where your complaint of too many puts you on the reality scale.

> For example, If his purpose with the

>LMT is really to provide a safe haven for those seeking to leave the S.O. , why

>would he locate the group at 33 Fort Harrison.

This an example of the plethoric out-points?

But you are saying that you don't know Bob's purpose. How will that fly in court? Lad, I think you should hang in there until January 6, keep good records, and then beat feet to 33 NFH.

> For obvious reasons this is the

>worst possible location imaginable for such an operation.

What are the obvious reasons? They aren't obvious to me. I'd say it's a pretty blessed location.

000346



>However if the purpose is simply to harass the C. of S. it is an ideal  
>location.

Look, Scientology will claim it's harassed, will whine it's harassed,  
will send people like you out to generate the illusion that it's  
harassed. Your org masters will incite or directly order SO personnel  
to fake harassment and file fake harassment charges.

Remember, there are victims and pretended victims. Don't let the  
pretended victims, the Miscavige regime Scientologists, incite  
contempt for real victims, especially victims of your own  
organization.

>  
>>Makes you go "Hmmm," maybe. When I >read posts like yours from Scientology  
>>agents  
>  
>Oops, you got me! But did you know that Diane Richardson, Bernie, Sterne and I  
>all work out of the same office?

Do you mean Sten-Arne? I don't believe you. I think he's got  
Scientology's number, and Scientology doesn't have his number. I think  
he's broken hearted, and I can understand that. Have you ever been  
broken hearted?

>  
>Ace

Very funny.

(c) Gerry Armstrong  
>





=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: Clap Clap Hip Hip Hooray Clap Clap  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)  
Date: Mon, 03 Jan 2000 05:55:12 GMT  
Message-ID: <387039be.941085@news.dowco.com>  
-----

On Sat, 1 Jan 2000 23:08:20 -0700, "Anti-Reg" <AntiReg@hotmail.com>  
wrote:

>The Church of Scientology has an odd custom. At the end of each course  
>session, a meeting (called "muster") is held where students share their  
>"wins." Immediately after muster, the course supervisor says something  
>like, "Let's end of with a hand for LRH!" Everyone stands, faces a large  
>photograph of L. Ron Hubbard, claps enthusiastically, and shouts "hip hip  
>hooray" exactly three times.

Unless something really special has occurred, in which case, everyone  
shouts "hip hip hooray" exactly ten times.

But the "exactly three times" is probably specified in bulletins.

It's funny, I can remember years ago, when I was busy deprogramming  
myself that the clapping for Ron hit me like it seems it's hit you.  
And I've thought of it many times since. Ron getting the clap.

On the Apollo, I think, was where the practice of 10 hip hip hoorays  
developed. I can't remember the event but remember the 10 cheers for  
the Commodore. And many 10 cheer events at the base in Clearwater.

The RPF in Clearwater had its own muster program and patter. Wins, and

a yelled "The RPF is what we make it. The RPF is where we make it."  
And Ron's titles were also yelled in a Chinese School drill,  
"Commodore, Founder, Source." In La Quinta and Gilman we didn't yell  
for security reasons. Hip hip hooray!

>

>At the small org here, the Division 6 (introductory) courses are held in the  
>same room as the Academy (advanced) courses, which means that the muster for

>both divisions is held together. Occasionally I would see a new person on  
>the Personal Efficiency course. At the end of course, they would be visibly  
>uncomfortable with the "hip hip hooray" thing. New people usually never  
>lasted for more than a few days before they disappeared permanently.

One of the feelings that can be associated with Scientology is  
profound embarrassment. A good laugh helps it pass. Getting your money  
back will also help.

I remember thinking that I lacked something and feeling a little sad  
because I didn't feel as exuberant as the Sea Org members around me  
looked like they felt. But I probably acted just as exuberant as the  
next guy.

>

>I was never that excited about doing it, but I did it anyway.

You see. Just like me

>Scientists just know it's something they're supposed to do.

If they don't, they will find their minds being probed and their lives  
controlled by ethics.

The Stalin regime, 've read, used the length of time people clapped at  
the Communists' events as an indicator of Counter Intention. If you  
didn't clap or if you didn't cheer during the Hubbard regime you would  
be ethics bait. Everyone clapped and cheered. I imagine Scientists  
are still clapping and cheering under Miscavige.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

>--

>

>The Anti-Reg, ATS (Actual Trouble Source)

>

>"I got regged one too many times!"

>-----

>"They smell of all the baths they didnt take.





=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: Psychiatry- Fiction Science  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)  
Date: Mon, 03 Jan 2000 05:56:51 GMT  
Message-ID: <38703a02.1009333@news.dowco.com>

-----  
On 01 Jan 2000 22:49:04 GMT, travissargent@aol.com (TravisSargent)  
wrote:

>On Thu, 30 Dec 1999 18:36:06 +0000, Steve A <stevea@castle-systems.co.uk>  
>wrote:

>

>Was: Drugs and Mother Nature (Was Re: The search for a cure)

>

>>Psychiatry is at least honest enough to admit that it doesn't  
>>know the answer in every case. Moreover, psychiatry, in common  
>>with all other branches of medical science, is aware that there is very  
>>rarely one convenient identifiable single cause for the illnesses it treats.

>

>Excuse me, I was a little stunned there for a moment that you seemed  
>to be actually defending the "honesty" of psychiatry. Careful.  
>Dangerous occupation these days. Terribly naive too,  
>unfortunately. Psychiatry has been forced to admit a lot of things  
>Steve. Such as the fact that they do not know the cause of "mental  
>illness", and cannot cure it. Never have and never will. Why? .....

Do you know what the cause of mental illness is?

Can you cure it?

Or are you just attacking people in the mental illness field out of  
your guilt that you don't know what the cause of mental illness is  
either? Your guilt that you can't cure it either?

But it's Scientology which is being forced to admit that they do  
not know the cause of mental illness, and cannot cure it. You do admit  
this, right? I'm a Scientologist and I'd be the first to admit it.

(c) Gerry Armstrong





=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: No checks and balances in power in Co\$  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)  
Date: Mon, 03 Jan 2000 06:06:50 GMT  
Message-ID: <38703c57.1606740@news.dowco.com>

-----  
On Sat, 01 Jan 2000 20:42:36 GMT, cultxpt@primenet.com (Jeff Jacobsen) wrote:

> The Founding Fathers of the United States were considered brilliant  
> partly because they devised a government that had checks and balances  
> in power. In Scientology, however, there are no checks and balances  
> that I can see on the leadership. In fact, DM took power through a  
> coup.

Yep. Grabbed the reins of power in a coup d'etat.

> I'm sure most Scientologists will say "so what, we trust our  
> leadership because they are the most ethical people on the planet."  
> Well then, let me point you to the sad story of the Baptist Foundation  
> of Arizona.

And any other groups or nations ruled by unbalanced dictatorships.

> Many Baptists poured their lifes' savings into the BFA, despite the  
> fact that it was not backed by an governmental insurance like a bank  
> savings would be. But why not trust them? This was a Christian  
> financial institution whose purpose was to pour profits not only back  
> to investors, but also to promote the Baptist faith. It was run by  
> fellow Baptists, and certainly they could be trusted, right?

>  
> From the recent Phoenix New Times article:

>  
> BFA folks were "friends," investor Barbara Dodson explained at the  
> hearing. BFA was family. BFA salesmen and officials joined investors  
> at their kitchen tables for coffee, took the old folks out to dinner.  
> Naturally, investors trusted them. BFA folks were good Christians.

>  
> "They were our friends," said Dodson.

>

>"But they were crooks."

>

>\*\*\*\*\*

>

> Certainly there was a warning about this allegedly largest charity  
>scam in US history. Again from the article:

>

>At the December 21 [1999] hearing, Mike Maxson sat quietly in a  
>corner, listening to the Reverend Armstrong blast BFA officials for  
>being un-Christian.

>

>Maxson is a former BFA staff accountant who was among several CPAs and  
>an attorney who quit BFA in 1996 after notifying their bosses several  
>times of potentially fraudulent financial irregularities. Maxson and  
>his family were ostracized from their Southern Baptist church for  
>"causing trouble" at BFA.

>

>\*\*\*\*\*

>

>The New Times began a large series on the BFA's money schemes more  
>than a year before the BFA was finally closed down. So there was  
>plenty of warning, yet the investors relied on their trust and paid no  
>heed to contrary evidence to their expectations.

>

> Now, we come to the Church of Scientology. Do you Scientologists  
>know how your money is being spent by the leadership of your church?  
>Do you know how much was spent on the LA Sports Arena event, for  
>example? Or how much is spent on attorneys' fees to simply harass  
>critics? Do you have any say in how your auditing money is being  
>spent? What kind of checks and balances are built into the Co\$  
>financial system, so that the sad case of the BFA won't be repeated  
>within Scientology? Are you just going to trust the leadership and  
>not think there is any need for checks and balances? What will you  
>say when your trust is shown to be unfounded?

And you who know what's going on, who know that millions are being  
spent to attack good people, who know that money is squandered on  
lawyers to suppress people's civil rights, who know that lies are  
being told, do you also know that if you come forward with what you



Re: No checks and balances in power in Co\$

Page 3

know you will like Lisa McPherson be dragged into some room, isolated and held until you're neutralized? Come forward anyway!

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

><http://www.phoenixnewtimes.com/issues/1999-12-30/news2.html>

>see <http://www.phoenixnewtimes.com/1998/121098/baptist3.html> for all

>the articles

>

>\* \* \* \*

><http://www.primenet.com/~cultxpt/cos.htm>

000353



10. *How do you feel about the way the police handle the situation?*

\_\_\_\_\_

=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: The passage of power  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)  
Date: Mon, 03 Jan 2000 06:04:55 GMT  
Message-ID: <38703a25.1044787@news.dowco.com>  
-----

On 01 Jan 2000 22:34:24 GMT, croesus123@aol.com (Croesus123) wrote:

>The following is taken from Theta's "Criminal Time Track". It posses some  
>interesting ideas but also some problems.

>

>"In the months after Ron's death, Vaughn Young spent a lot of time with Pat  
>Broker and they became friends. Vaughn learned a lot about LRH's life while he  
>was in hiding the last few years.

>

>A power struggle erupted over the next 18 months over who would take control of  
>Scientology. A key element in the struggle was LRH's last message to the rank  
>and file. It was a message from Ron issued as a Sea Org Directive. It said good  
>bye, wished them well and establishing a new rank/position called Loyal  
>Officer. Pat was LO 1 and his wife Annie was LO 2 and it basically turned the  
>management of the Sea Org over to them. And since the Sea Org ran Scientology  
>that meant they were at the top of the heap. [Croesus -This is not true if the  
>reorganization of Scientology putting the RTC and CST on top is accepted, See  
>below].

RTC and CST are manned by Sea Org personnel. It is not accepted that  
RTC and CST are on top independent of the \$O. It could have been the  
Broeker regime which grabbed power after Hubbard's "death." But it was  
Miscavige and his regime. The regime includes \$O staff in RTC, CST,  
C\$I, and other "orgs," plus lawyers "retained" by these various  
corporations and individuals, plus PIs, plus accountants.

> David Miscavige was not mentioned in the Directive.

>

>So, Pat slowly started to take control. There was a power struggle and DM won  
>and quickly purged the Sea Org of Broeker supporters as he consolidated his  
>power. Vaughn was sent to RPF for 16 months & had 3 escape attempts. While in  
>the RPF a directive came out from Miscavige saying that the final message from  
>LRH was a forgery by Broeker and was canceled. That same day



>  
>Annie appeared in the RPF, a completely broken person. She was kept underguard,  
>just to be sure.  
>  
>With the cancellation of the message from Ron there was now two things missing:  
>a goodbye message and a hat turn over. So if the Directive was a forgery, where  
>was the real goodbye message and hat turn over? Where were Roan's wishes, in  
>writing?  
>  
>David Miscavige never provided anything and everyone was afraid to ask for fear  
>of being sent to the RPF. Pat Broeker disappeared."  
>  
>Has anyone ever produced a copy of that final message to the Sea Org? From the  
>text "While in the RPF a directive came out from Miscavige saying that the  
>final message from LRH was a forgery by Broeker and was canceled" it would seem  
>that if one existed it must have been seen by a number of people. Someone  
>probably kept a copy. Where is it?  
>  
>It always seemed funny to me there was never a final message; that LRH never  
>wrote up a rather clear explanation of how he was to pass on power after his  
>death.  
>  
>Were the Broekers ever main players in the RTC and the CST? If Hubbard had  
>really wanted them to be the main controllers it seems he would have appointed  
>them trustees of the two entities at some point. Remember these entities were  
>around for a few years before his death - ample time to appoint the Broekers as  
>the main players. If he didn't why didn't he? Maybe the message from LRH was  
>just to the Sea Org personaell assigning the Broekers to top Sea Org positions.  
>But this is not assigning them as final legal controlling authority given the  
>trustees of these two entities. We can't tell until we see the actual message.  
>  
>But another problem emerges which is personal to my viewpoint. I personally  
>believe that the RTC and CST was the structured designed by Hubbard in the  
>massive reorganization after the GO - FBI fiasco. I say this since it is a very  
>powerful, well thought out design for the protection of Scientology against  
>takeover or corruption.

Actually it facilitates corruption. It corrupts absolutely.

> Hubbard was approaching death and these issues were



>firmly on his mind. But its workability depends completely on having the right  
>people in charge. On this I further believe that he assumed (after some test  
>while he was alive) that he would be able to influence certain people and  
>things "from the other side". I happen to personally know that Hubbard was not  
>the weak, feeble, drugged-out person portrayed by some people. He may have been  
>on the defensive against the legal forces against him but he was not under  
>anyone's control, that I can personally assure you.

Well I'm not so sure. Miscavige controlled to some degree Hubbard's communication lines. And if he didn't become weak, feeble and drugged, then his death would have been sudden and shocking, and there would have been found no drugs in his system. Drugs were found. And his signature the day before his claimed death indicates physical feebleness.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>



=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Clarification of Destruction (was LMT: Duality of Purpose)  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)  
Date: Tue, 04 Jan 2000 18:47:29 GMT  
Message-ID: <38723f21.6226468@news.dowco.com>  
-----

On 3 Jan 2000 13:59:16 GMT, rkeller@netaxs.com (Rod Keller) wrote:

>Gerry Armstrong (armstrong@dowco.com) wrote:  
>: On Sat, 1 Jan 2000 12:21:16 -0500, "t wilson" <twils@nightmail.com>  
>: > I MHO, the LMT should have (as we individual critics presumably do have)  
>: >two distinct goals.  
>: >  
>: > The first, and by far the more immediate, is the rescue of the souls  
>: >and bodies of those who are under the sway of the cult. The second is the  
>: >application of all lawful means to bring about the destruction of the cult  
>: >itself.  
>:  
>: Pretty succinct.  
>  
>It is illegal to organize in order to destroy another organization. I  
>think the mission statement posted before is better. "To carry out the  
>final wishes of Lisa McPherson's mother, Fannie, which were to expose the  
>abusive and deceptive practices of Scientology and to help those who have  
>been victimized by it."

I actually misread the first sentence and thought t wilson was stating his own goals which he presumes individual critics have. I called his goals succinct because they are marked by brief and compact expression and lack of unnecessary words and details, as Webster says. I may have erroneously given the impression that I thought these are my goals.

Destroying Scientology is an impossibility, so I would never embrace it as a goal. Scientology embraces the destruction of not only organizations but persons, thus it and its supporters have an impossible goal. That is really why I'm opposed to the organization. People will get hurt chasing impossible goals. Miscavige and his group think I, of all people, am a stumbling block to their impossible goals.



The \$cientologists should actually thank God that their goals of destruction of psychiatry, and psychs, and critics, and squirrels, and SPs like me, are impossible. Who would want a world in which by will not only psychiatry, psychs, critics, squirrels and SPs like me could be destroyed, but by necessity everyone and everything else?

I'm interested in the law which makes it illegal to organize in order to destroy another organization. That's CCHR. That's \$cientology itself.

But I can see where \$cientology's lawyers would use a \$cientological interpretation of such a law against even the concept of reform. Because \$cientology is exactly as it should be, being the perfect manifestation of Hubbard's intentions, any change would destroy the organization because it would not longer be the perfect manifestation of Hubbard's intention. Therefore reformers are attempting to destroy the organization. Ha, ha, ha.

When Hubbard said he wanted \$cientology to be seen as a reform group, he wanted the appearance of reformation to cloak his actual intention, destruction. At the same time \$cientology tries to cloak its opponents' actual intention of reformation with destruction.

The Fair Game Doctrine is basic to \$cientology. It contains, not just by implication, but enforced by fiat, the unassailable postulate that enemies, that is to say, wogs (R), "may be.....destroyed." It doesn't work. People cannot be destroyed. \$cientology: stop trying. Oh, what anguish your organization has generated pursuing the impossible goal to destroy people.

As for the Lisa McPherson Trust's mission statement, I think it's pretty succinct, poetic, honest, attainable, and I support it unequivocally.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

>--

>Rod Keller / rkeller@voicenet.com / Irresponsible Publisher



=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: LRH against Miscaviage's "New Order"  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)  
Date: Wed, 05 Jan 2000 09:15:06 GMT  
Message-ID: <38730b34.9683246@news.dowco.com>  
-----

On Tue, 4 Jan 2000 10:16:26 -0800, "Safe ... www.fza.org"  
<Safe@scientology.at> wrote:

>"Make sure that the remedy is passed along, that's all. Don't horde it,  
>don't hold it. If you ever do use any black dianetics, use it on the guy  
>who pulled scientology out of sight and made it so it wasn't available,  
>because he's the boy who would be electing himself the "New Order."

Hubbard says DM is fair game? He calls for \$cientologists to use black  
DN on DM? Who you gonna have do your thinking for you, \$cientologists,  
LRH, DM or yourself?

>  
>We don't need any more new orders. All those orders, as far as I am  
>concerned, have been filled.  
>  
>Anybody that knows the remedy of this subject, anybody that knows these  
>techniques, is himself actually under a certain responsibility - to make  
>sure he doesn't remain a sole proprietor.

Remember, the work was free. Keep it so.

>  
>DON'T EVER THINK THAT A MONOPOLY OF THIS SUBJECT IS A SAFE  
THING TO HAVE.  
>[Emphasis mine]  
>  
>It's not safe for Man, it's not safe for this universe. This universe has  
>long been looking for new ways to make slaves. Well, we've got some new  
>ways to make slaves here. Let's see that none are made."

Ron failed. Slaves are made by \$cientology every day. Anyone who says  
\$cientology works is its slave 'cause it don't.





=====

Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: [Fwd: Psychiatry- Fiction Science]  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)  
Date: Wed, 05 Jan 2000 08:46:16 GMT  
Message-ID: <38730455.7923904@news.dowco.com>

-----  
On Tue, 04 Jan 2000 23:36:37 -0800, Jason Fordham  
<jclf@interverse.com> wrote:

>This is a multi-part message in MIME format.  
>-----6E2C7C0DDE86A41BEF0D58A2  
>Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
>Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
>  
>Another disappearing post...  
>  
>-----6E2C7C0DDE86A41BEF0D58A2  
>Content-Type: message/rfc822  
>Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
>Content-Disposition: inline  
>  
>X-Mozilla-Status2: 00000000  
>Message-ID: <3872BCBB.BD4AEA62@interverse.com>  
>Date: Tue, 04 Jan 2000 19:38:35 -0800  
>From: Jason Fordham <jclf@interverse.com>  
>X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; I)  
>X-Accept-Language: en  
>MIME-Version: 1.0  
>Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
>To: TravisSargent <travissargent@aol.com>  
>Subject: Re: Psychiatry- Fiction Science  
>References: <38703a02.1009333@news.dowco.com>  
<20000104202952.29707.00000567@ng-bgl.aol.com>  
>Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
>Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
>  
>Travis, you sound like an eight-year-old, taunting. You should be embarrassed and  
>ashamed.  
>



>Now, let's consider a few historical facts - maturely, please.

>

>Mental hospitals and asylums existed long before Psychiatry or Insurance Companies.

>Bedlam (The Bethlem Royal Hospital) was founded over 750 years ago, in Camberwell.

Ah you missed Scientology's theology lessons. The "Psychs" (anyone with a degree in the field of the understanding of the mind) run back along the time track, since, as Hubbard would say, time immemorial. They were the implanters on the whole track. The catrists in Battlefield Earth.

>At the lowest point in its history, long before anyone called themselves a

>psychiatrist, the upper classes would go to the madhouse to watch the mentally ill

>as entertainment.

Wow, there's a concept I've never considered before.

>

>I am not a doctor, or a psychiatrist (so you can't attack me for being "part of the  
>conspiracy"), but the Introspection Rundown, Hubbard's "treatment" for psychotic  
>breaks, shows contempt for our fellow human beings. Not only is the prescribed  
>isolation cruel, but he adds a toxic "medication" in the shape of niacin.

My study of Hubbard's development of the "tech" for the isolation of "psychotic" people, and the way it has been used in virtually every instance when it was used, led me to the conclusion that it had no therapeutic basis or motivation whatsoever, but solely a security basis and motivation. Everything about the Lisa McPherson "isolation" confirms that conclusion.

People assigned to provide food, etc. to the person isolated deal with him or her muzzled (Hubbard's term) because Hubbard and Miscavige don't want the security risk infecting the crew. Hubbard, and DM, of course, in all "handlings" don't have to be muzzled.

>

>The psychiatrists I have met have all been compassionate people, who care for their  
>patients. They are all committed to helping sick people get well, rather than  
>locking them in a room with no human contact or care, maybe to get well on their  
>own. Or not, with possibly - and demonstrably, in the case of Lisa McPherson -



>tragic consequences.

It's funny, really. Hubbard's and Scientology's attack on psychiatry is actually insane.

>

>Travis, if you were to apply your passion to correcting this insane practice, you  
>would stand to make Scientology a place safe for all human beings. The way things  
>are, Scientology is repulsive to any compassionate person - a basic attribute of a  
>humanitarian, which, I'm afraid, rules Hubbard out of the class.

The scary thing is what happens if Scientologists don't wake up to the pleas to stop the repulsiveness. Nuttiness is pretty well always unnerving. But nuttiness bent on obliteration with a billion dollars to blow makes it scary.

>

>So please, wake up, and grow up.

Yes. Stop scaring people. Stupidity scares people, Scientology.

>Either recognise that people trying to help people  
>is a fine and noble thing which can go wrong, or acknowledge your contempt for a  
>compassionate profession once and for all; in other words, declare yourself to have  
>compassion, or none.

Oh yeah, all you Scientologists. Think for yourself. Think for yourself about psychs, about SPs, about the fifth invaders.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

>J

>

>TravisSargent wrote:

>

>> On Mon, 03 Jan 2000 05:56:51 GMT, armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry

>> Armstrong) wrote:

>>



=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: Co\$ stalking questions  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)  
Date: Thu, 06 Jan 2000 16:17:25 GMT  
Message-ID: <3874bffb.2908670@news.dowco.com>  
-----

On Thu, 06 Jan 2000 09:18:42 GMT, cultxpt@primenet.com (Jeff Jacobsen) wrote:

>Tonight Larry King had guests talking about stalking. They never  
>talked about stalking by proxy, likes happens to Bob Minton and Stacy  
>Brooks. Couldn't Mike Rinder be charged with stalking, since he hires  
>the PIs who do the stalking for him?

Yes, indeed. What Scientology does in execution of its programs against enemies is stalking. It hasn't been pronounced stalking by statute, but that is just something Scientology and other corporate stalkers have to look forward to.

> Couldn't you write a legal  
>notice to him warning him about this? Some sort of legal wording like:  
>  
>"Dear chicken-ass Rinder,

Well, I would write, Dear Mike:

>  
> Too much of a pussy-boy to do your own stalking eh? Using those  
>tax-free Scientology dollars to hire PI's to do your illegal dirty  
>work, huh? Well, this is a notice to you that that charade ain't  
>gonna work, and if you keep doing it, your ass will wind up in jail."

And I would say that differently, but try to make the same point.

>  
> I just don't get how he couldn't be charged right now with all the  
>stuff that's happened already.

He can. DM can. Scientology can. The evidence is in. Now it just takes



Re: Co\$ stalking questions

Page 2

the will.

I kept this big handlettered sign in my storefront window in San Anselmo during the 1992-5 period:

|   |              |   |
|---|--------------|---|
| ! |              | ! |
| ! | IS           | ! |
| ! | \$CIENTOLOGY | ! |
| ! | STALKING     | ! |
| ! | YOU?         | ! |
| ! |              | ! |

They sure stalk me.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

>\*\*\*

><http://www.primenet.com/~cultxpt/cos.htm>

000364



=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: LMT: Duality of Purpose  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)  
Date: Thu, 06 Jan 2000 16:18:26 GMT  
Message-ID: <3874c046.2984048@news.dowco.com>

-----  
On Wed, 05 Jan 2000 17:58:48 GMT, zebec@my-deja.com wrote:

>In article <84q9vk\$rb1@netaxs.com>,  
> rkeller@netaxs.com (Rod Keller) wrote:  
>  
>snip  
>  
>> It is illegal to organize in order to destroy another organization.  
>  
>> Rod Keller  
>  
>That is what the LMT is all about!

No that is what your organization is all about. Scientology is a hate group organized to destroy everything it hates.

This attack on the Lisa McPherson Trust is just to stir up Scientologists and others to hate and attack the Trust.

There's blood on Scientology's hands and blood in their programs.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>  
>Couch it in nicer words if you wish but don't misguide the critics here.

Don't worry clam man. The critics have got your number.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>  
>  
>Sent via Deja.com <http://www.deja.com/>





=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: The Reform of Scientology  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)  
Date: Sun, 16 Jan 2000 20:22:49 GMT  
Message-ID: <38822843.680075@news.dowco.com>

-----  
P & M

On Fri, 14 Jan 2000 14:01:56 -0800, Bob Minton <bob@minton.org> wrote:

>The Lisa McPherson Trust  
>  
>33 North Fort Harrison Avenue  
>Clearwater, Florida 33755  
>  
>Tel: (727) 467-9335  
>Fax: (727) 467-9345  
>Email: info@lisamcphersontrust.net  
>Web: www.lisamcphersontrust.net  
>  
>  
>Our Mission Statement  
>  
>To expose the abusive and deceptive practices of Scientology and to  
>help those who have been victimized by it. These were the final wishes  
>of Lisa McPherson's mother, Fannie, who died before Scientology was  
>held to account for Lisa's death.  
>  
>Our Objectives  
>  
>To accomplish our mission, we will demystify and thereby make  
>transparent the coercive processes and practices of Scientology. In  
>this way, informed consumers can make an educated decision about  
>whether Scientology can meet their psychological or spiritual needs.  
>  
>We will expose Scientology's abuse of the human, civil and privacy  
>rights of its members and critics. We will reveal its deceptive  
>advertising practices that border on consumer fraud. We will bring to  
>light those "religious practices" that violate civil or criminal law.



>At the same time, we will respect the right of all Scientologists to  
>embrace any religious belief they may choose.

>

>We will assist former Scientologists in recovering from their unique  
>personal experience with the abusive and deceptive practices of  
>Scientology. We will offer counsel to Scientologists who choose to  
>hear the truth about how Scientology uses deceptive mind control  
>techniques. Our dedicated staff will provide the information, love and  
>support to Scientologists that will enable them to release the bonds

>of cult mind control.

>

>Finally, all of the people involved in the Lisa McPherson Trust will  
>respect the dignity and innate human goodness of all current, former  
>and recovering Scientologists.

>

>Our Philosophy

>

>The Board of Directors, Advisory Committee and staff of the Lisa  
>McPherson Trust include a number of former Scientologists who have had  
>firsthand experience with Scientology's abuse, and they are all in  
>some way still recovering from it. They are decent, caring and  
>compassionate human beings who have chosen to help others that have  
>made similar uninformed decisions about Scientology. Moreover, they  
>are willing and able to share their innermost personal experiences in  
>the Sea Organization or as Public Scientologists in order to educate  
>and immunize others against the abuses and deceptions of Scientology.

>

>Scientology draws its members from a broad cross-section of society,  
>and, like other destructive cults, uses a sophisticated combination of  
>deceptive recruiting methods, false promises, hypnosis, behavior  
>modification, sleep deprivation, dietary manipulation, information  
>control, phobia indoctrination and other mind control techniques to  
>entice and control its members. There is no shame in having been  
>seduced into a group like Scientology. Likewise, there need be no  
>reluctance to leave after discovering that the organization is not  
>capable of delivering on its promise of a "Road to Total Freedom."

This is reading excellently.



>  
>Real freedom begins and ends with the never-ending quest of the human  
>spirit to be free. This perpetual quest is the single most important  
>factor that keeps mind control from being irreversible. Organized  
>Scientology's claim of eight million members is a deception. Informed  
>estimates indicate that there are at most 200,000 active  
>Scientists in the world today. What is clear is that the vast  
>majority of people who try Scientology reject it, because this  
>organization does not deliver on its promises.

>  
>The Board of Directors, Advisory Committee and staff of the Lisa  
>McPherson Trust will do our part in Clearwater, Florida, to see that  
>the human spirit of all Scientists will always have a pathway to  
>real freedom.

>  
>Lisa's Story

>  
>The story of Lisa McPherson's death broke in 1996, a year after she  
>died in the Church of Scientology's Fort Harrison Hotel after being  
>held against her will for seventeen days. As the details of her tragic  
>and senseless death began to be publicized, more and more people  
>across the country came together through the Internet to oppose the  
>abuses occurring in Scientology.

>  
>The Reform of Scientology

>  
>The Lisa McPherson Trust started operations in Clearwater, Florida on  
>January 6, 2000. It was formed after decades of exhaustive  
>investigation by media and government agencies as well as firsthand  
>accounts from hundreds of former Scientists. For more than  
>twenty-five years there have been outcries that the Church of  
>Scientology abandon its abusive and deceptive practices. But until  
>now, there has been no formal organization committed to stopping these  
>abuses. The Lisa McPherson Trust was established for that purpose, and  
>we are now calling for the Church of Scientology to make the following  
>reforms:

- >  
>1) Tell their members and the public the truth about the life of  
>Scientology founder L. Ron Hubbard.  
>2) Tell their members and the public the truth about true story of the

^^^^^^^^^^

- > history of Dianetics and Scientology.
- >3) Cease all illegal, unethical and harassing activities against their
- > own members and those who criticize or disagree with Scientology.
- >4) Stop violating the civil and human rights of Scientologists and
- > those who criticize or disagree with Scientology..
- >5) Stop practicing medicine without a license and preventing people
- > from receiving proper medical treatment.
- >6) Stop using and abusing the legal system as a means of harassment.
- >7) Stop keeping the technology of Scientology secret if it truly has
- > the power to help the human race.
- >8) Encourage Scientologists to speak freely among themselves. Urge
- > them to communicate with family and friends, even those who may
- > disagree with Scientology. End the practice of "disconnection."
- >9) Stop using private and personal material from confidential
- > counseling sessions to blackmail, harass and intimidate.
- >10) Stop using duress to extract exorbitant sums of money from their
- > members.
- >
- >The Lisa McPherson Trust firmly believes in religious freedom for all.
- >But we do not believe that anyone has the right to engage in behavior
- >that violates other people's rights or the laws of the land.
- >ScientologistsThe Church of Scientology has have every right to

^^^^^^^^^^

- >participate in the world's religious community in practicing their
- >sincerely held religious beliefs. However, the Church of Scientology
- >needs to cease its abusive and deceptive practices.

>

>Our Officers

>

- >Stacy Brooks, President
- >Jesse Prince, Executive Vice President
- >Kim Baker, Vice President
- >Mark Bunker, Vice President
- >David Cecere, Vice President
- >Brian Haney, Secretary
- >Duncan Pierce, Treasurer

>

>Our Board



>  
>Peter Alexander  
>Stacy Brooks  
>Gabe Cazares  
>Patricia Greenway  
>Brian Haney  
>Jeff Jacobsen  
>Rod Keller  
>Kim Krenek  
>Dell Liebreich  
>Ed Lottick  
>BobRobert Minton  
>Duncan Pierce  
>Jesse Prince  
>  
>Our Advisory Committee  
>  
>Gerry Armstrong  
>Ida Camburn  
>Priscilla Coates  
>Paulette Cooper  
>Ken Dandar  
>Ray Emmons  
>Steve Hassan  
>Keith Henson  
>Dan Leipold  
>Arnie Lerma  
>Frank Oliver  
>Margaret Thaler Singer  
>Lawrence Wollersheim  
>  
>We trust that there are many who will join us in our crusade.  
>  
>Bob Minton,  
>Chairman  
>The Lisa McPherson Trust

Excellent, unflinching, and I think perfectly legally defensible.

I noted a couple of minor punctuation errors above.





=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: Clearwater Stroll  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)  
Date: Wed, 19 Jan 2000 23:58:19 GMT  
Message-ID: <38864f0e.8748786@news.dowco.com>  
-----

On 19 Jan 2000 15:20:52 GMT, rkeller@netaxs.com (Rod Keller) wrote:

>I recently had the opportunity to stroll around downtown Clearwater, and  
>thought I would let folks know what's been going on. The Trust building  
>has front and rear entrances, and I went out the back door to Watterson  
>Ave. and walked on the sidewalk to the corner of Cleveland. I was  
>videotaped by a Scientologist every time I walked this block. I crossed  
>the white lines, said "hi" to Mr. Diller and turned the corner onto  
>Cleveland. On other days I saw large cameras on tripods on Watterson and  
>on Ft. Harrison adjacent to the Bank. This day was just one guy with a  
>hand-held camcorder. I waved and smiled.

Have Clearwater citizens, generally, just stopped coming into the  
heavily occupied and fortified part of the city? It must be very weird  
to know of the continual Scientology surveillance going on.

>  
>The wrapping paper has been removed from the Coachman building, but the  
>blinds are all drawn unlike other times I have visited. I turned South on  
>Ft. Harrison, and walked down to the 200 block. The Super Power  
>construction site looks unchanged to me. No work has begun to build the  
>structure any higher, and the covered walkway is still there. The city  
>barricades have been removed, and I walked in front of the flammable

^^^^^^

>tunnel. The flammable green structure is still covering the Fort Harrison,  
^^^^^^

This is a rather incendiary thing to say.

>but no sidewalk work seems to be underway on that block.

>

>I turned West on Court St. and North onto Osceola, behind the Fort

>Harrison. Workers were installing the new sidewalk on that side. It's  
>poured concrete with a field of red color and smaller rectangles of white  
>or yellow, about 2 ft. x 3 ft. I didn't see any texture or brick pattern.  
>It reminds me of the decking around a public pool. The workers seemed to  
>be professionals, not SO/RPF. They all responded when I said "hi". I  
>turned the corner East onto Pierce St. where sidewalks are also being  
>poured in the same pattern. A crowd of Scientologists stood in the back  
>entranceway. I waved.  
>  
>Vans are being used all over downtown to shuttle Scientologists. I waved  
>at all of them, and got several waves back. I didn't have a shirt or sign  
>to identify me as an SP.

No OTs in those vans.

>The parrots were chirping, the sun was shining,  
>it was a pleasant day downtown. Too bad about the cult.

Nevertheless, an exceedingly happy report.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>  
>--

>Rod Keller / rkeller@voicenet.com / Irresponsible Publisher  
>Black Hat #1 / Expert of the Toilet / CWPD Mouthpiece / Killer Rod  
>The Lerma Apologist / Merchant of Chaos / Vision of Destruction  
>Bigot of Mystery / OSA Patsy / Quasi-Scieno / Mental Bully





From: armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: The Lisa McPherson Trust---some revisions  
Date: Wed, 19 Jan 2000 23:42:13 GMT  
Message-ID: <38864bb5.7891937@news.dowco.com>  
References: <3888883b.56518685@ARSCC.Sweden.Dep.OSA.Surveillance>  
<20000119091442.03560.00000066@ng-cs1.news.cs.com>  
X-Newsreader: Forte Free Agent 1.11/32.235  
NNTP-Posting-Host: tchl098.chw.dowco.com  
X-Trace: 19 Jan 2000 15:43:04 -0800, tchl098.chw.dowco.com  
Lines: 31  
Path:  
newsmaster1.prod.itd.earthlink.net!nntp.earthlink.net!newsfeed1.earthlink.net!news.idt.net!news.vphos.net!tchl098.chw.dowco.com  
Xref: nntp.earthlink.net alt.religion.scientology:1061194

-----  
On 19 Jan 2000 14:14:42 GMT, afolderman@cs.com (Afolderman) wrote:

>someone said  
>>However,  
>>the Church of Scientology needs to cease its abusive and deceptive  
>>practices.  
>Which means that Scientology must cease. Period.  
>  
>  
>  
>Actually I think the statement means what the statement says, that Scientology  
>must cease it's abusive practices.No sense abbreviating the mission statement,  
>to broaden the target. Guys like the above who condemn all of Scientology,  
>including the "freedom of speech" codes and the humanitarian stuff, are  
>"anti-freedom of religion guys", who are as bad as the bad guys in any church".

Well, not necessarily. Freedom of religion includes the freedom to  
condemn all of \$cientology.

And in truth I've never found anyone who condemns all of \$cientology.  
Any lie is automatically condemned, but never any \$cientologist.  
\$cientologists are what is real and lasting and worth saving in  
\$cientology. Even DM and the tyrant class.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>  
>  
>I'll say to you, as I would say to the church,

000374

43





=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology

Subject: Re: Stephen A. Kent Affidavit in McPherson Criminal case

From: armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)

Date: Mon, 24 Jan 2000 00:02:14 GMT

Message-ID: <388b964c.4197935@news.dowco.com>

-----  
On Sun, 23 Jan 2000 22:56:43 GMT, mw59@my-deja.com wrote:

>(mailed and posted)

>In article <ujrk8s4m1nhp778tk1jd2bra98si0bgchn@4ax.com>,

> Bob Minton <bob@minton.org> wrote:

>> On 22 Jan 2000 17:47:27 -0800, Arnie Lerma <alerma@dgsys.com> wrote:

>

>>>

>>>AFFIDAVIT

>>>CITY OF EDMONTON

>>>PROVINCE OF ALBERTA

>>>BEFORE ME, the undersigned authority, Stephen A. Kent personally  
>appeared, and

>>>whom I know on a professional basis, and after first being duly  
>affirmed by me

>>>states:

>>>

>>>1. I, Stephen A. Kent, Ph.D., the undersigned affiant, am a  
>professor at the

>>>University of Alberta in the Department of Sociology, and  
>incorporate my

>>>attached curriculum vitae to this affidavit.

>>>

>>>This was in the civil case, not the criminal case.

>>>

>>>Bob Minton

>

>Oh, what profound words of wisdom. You should not have snip'd the part  
>about the dollars though:

>

>> For preparing this report I have been compensated at the rate of

>> \$200.00 per hour. I have worked approximately 55 hours on it.

>

>That is a grand total of \$11,000. Did you pay him in cash or by cheque?

>

>BTW. Did you know that people are saying that it is you who is trying

>to make money by making this newsgroup such a stinking and rotten place?

You have it wrong. This newsgroup is a hotbed of free speech, and a rallying place for wogs (R) in your dirty war on us. Scientology is the stinking and rotten place. And Hubbard and DM have made Scientology the stinking and rotten place it is, not Bob.

Good to see Dr. Kent get paid for his work. And good to know that when the Scientology cult takes his deposition in McPherson v. Scientology the stinking, rotten cult will have to pay him \$200 per hour. Ha, ha, ha, ha, ha.

Well done Bob. Well done Dr. Kent. Well done Ken Dandar. Well done all wogs (R) in combatting Scientology in its stinking, rotten war on us all.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

>Michael Wallace ---

>"Speech is a mirror of the soul: as a man speaks, so he is."

>--- Publilius Syrus

>

>

>Sent via Deja.com <http://www.deja.com/>

>Before you buy.





From: armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: McCabe response now webbed  
Date: Sat, 29 Jan 2000 20:56:39 GMT  
Message-ID: <389353f3.3969929@news.dowco.com>  
References: <86v2rk\$59n@netaxs.com> <38933E1E.1594FB69@for.mail>  
X-Newsreader: Forte Free Agent 1.11/32.235  
NNTP-Posting-Host: tchl092.chw.dowco.com  
X-Trace: 29 Jan 2000 12:57:31 -0800, tchl092.chw.dowco.com  
Lines: 39  
Path:  
newsmaster1.prod.itd.earthlink.net!nntp.earthlink.net!newsfeed1.earthlink.net!newsfeed.dir  
ect.ca!news.vphos.net!tchl092.chw.dowco.com  
Xref: nntp.earthlink.net alt.religion.scientology:1065891  
-----

On Sun, 30 Jan 2000 03:23:10 +0800, xScn\_Lurker <not@for.mail> wrote:

>Rod Keller wrote:

>>

>> I put up a proofread and spellchecked version of the McCabe Response in  
>> the Lisa McPherson criminal case. It's a frightening document if you  
>> missed it the first time, and now you can figure out all the footnotes.

>

>I for one certainly appreciate the effort put into this version -  
>infinitely more readable.

>

>You can see McCabe's contempt throughout this - refusing to refer to it  
>as a church, but rather always a 'corporation' and to Scns as 'corporate  
>employees', and repeatedly pointing out how many times they lied.

>

>But as I understand it, the worst penalty the Co\$ can expect is \$15,000  
>? I guess we can only hope the judge's summary will make up for that.

Scientology's penalty for killing Lisa with its suppressive tech of  
ignorance is its thousand cut death. Every day it pays more penalty.  
Lisa McPherson has passed Travolta as the most famous Scientologist.  
She haunts DM's mind. She haunts every Scientologist in Clearwater,  
indeed around the world. She is in every newspaper morgue in the  
country. She is in pretty well every website critical of Scientology.  
She will cost the cult billions in income and cost DM his emperorsip.  
DM should, if he had any sense, come clean about Lisa and come clean  
about every other tragedy he and his cultists have perpetrated and  
hidden. But he won't because he is in hiding and sinking down into  
total hallucinatory cause. His guilt and Scientology's guilt for their

000377

torture and murder of Lisa will result in more torture and death, for which there will be more guilt and more penalties The Super Power building will stand, if it ever stands, as a monument to Lisa's life and terrible death. When Scientology completely crumbles it will finally pay the just penalty for this crime. Bless her beautiful soul. A perfect innocent, a slaughtered lamb, will take down DM's cult of greed and power. That's the penalty Scientology will pay.

(c) Gerry Armstrong





From: armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: McCabe response now webbed  
Date: Sat, 29 Jan 2000 20:55:25 GMT  
Message-ID: <3893525c.3563110@news.dowco.com>  
References: <86v2rk\$59n@netaxs.com>  
X-Newsreader: Forte Free Agent 1.11/32.235  
NNTP-Posting-Host: tchl092.chw.dowco.com  
X-Trace: 29 Jan 2000 12:56:17 -0800, tchl092.chw.dowco.com  
Lines: 27  
Path:  
newsmaster1.prod.itd.earthlink.net!nntp.earthlink.net!newsfeed1.earthlink.net!newsfeed.dir  
ect.ca!news.vphos.net!tchl092.chw.dowco.com  
Xref: nntp.earthlink.net alt.religion.scientology:1065890  
-----

On 29 Jan 2000 16:00:52 GMT, rkeller@netaxs.com (Rod Keller) wrote:

>I put up a proofread and spellchecked version of the McCabe Response in  
>the Lisa McPherson criminal case. It's a frightening document if you  
>missed it the first time, and now you can figure out all the footnotes.

Thanks Rod. It is indeed a frightening document. Scientologists lie en masse. Lying is part of their pathology. I was once a lying Scientologist, saved when I discovered that I was doing all that lying for a pathological liar.

Stop the lies, DM. It is Scientology's only hope for survival. It is your hope for survival. If you and your organization quite lying, we'll all go off and do something else. So would Bernie McCabe. Otherwise, we're here for the duration. Your choice, my little liar.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>  
><http://www.parishioner.org/mccabe.html>  
>  
>--  
>Rod Keller / rkeller@voicenet.com / Irresponsible Publisher  
>Black Hat #1 / Expert of the Toilet / CWPD Mouthpiece / Killer Rod  
>The Lerma Apologist / Merchant of Chaos / Vision of Destruction  
>Bigot of Mystery / OSA Patsy / Quasi-Scieno / Mental Bully





=====  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Re: DM missing?  
From: armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)  
Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2000 01:30:46 GMT  
Message-ID: <389392c2.1643230@news.dowco.com>  
-----

On Sat, 29 Jan 2000 19:48:17 -0500, Lronscam  
<NQSPAMLronssc@aol.comNOTs> wrote:

>In article <87001p\$8nf\$1@nntp2.atl.mindspring.net>,  
>hkhenson@netcom8.netcom.com says...  
>>Grady Ward <grady@gradyward.com> wrote:  
>>> On 29 Jan 2000 22:47:12 GMT, Keith Henson  
>>> <hkhenson@netcom8.netcom.com> wrote:  
>>  
>>>>The word seeps out of CW that Miscavige's lawyers have been ordered not  
>>>>accept service on (\*) being added to the Lisa McPherson case.  
>>  
>>> I cannot parse this sentence. As far as I know,  
>>> Miscavige has already been added to the suit.  
>>  
>>The judge permitted him to be added to the suit, but he need to be given  
>>legal notice. His lawyers were supposed to accept service for him, but  
>>have now back out of being willing to do so.  
>>  
>>Keith Henson  
>>  
>  
>The damn US legal system is one of the most absurd things in this world. How  
>silly is it that you have a public figure, whereby hundreds of people must  
>keep in contact with him on a monthly basis and you can't serve this person  
>by proxy. He was even quoted by a news paper, no less, acknowledging the  
>suit. I can see this trial getting started in about 3 or 4 years.

The cult lawyers know DM will be served, and should just accept  
service on his behalf. But the cult's policy is to Dev-T the  
opposition and run up costs as much as possible. That's all part of  
being a criminal cult. Thus they always do the discourteous thing. DM  
can be served by publication. Or Dandar can move the court for an



order that since DM is the head of the cult, service on the cult's lawyers is good service. Either way, it does delay the inevitable a little, does Dev-T Dandar and does cost more money. IANAL.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>--

>

>Web page summary: <http://www.enttheta.net>

>The best overall site: <http://www>

>Chris Owen's site:

><http://www.demon.co.uk/castle/audit/index.html>

>The name says it all: <http://www.ronthewarhero.org>

>Co\$ book list: <http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~dst/Library>

>Real Audio files of Co\$, pickets, LRH, etc:

><http://www>



From: armstrong@dowco.com (Gerry Armstrong)  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology  
Subject: Researching Hubbard the Pathological Liar (was More Questions for the OSA  
Sock Puppets)  
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 2000 23:29:56 GMT  
Message-ID: <38af260b.824846@news.dowco.com>  
References: <dT%q4.1027\$jT5.86297@newsin1.ispchannel.com>  
<wlitOPL+kJU4MVTmKC5aIbCEy2Uq@4ax.com>  
X-Newsreader: Forte Free Agent 1.11/32.235  
NNTP-Posting-Host: dial-231.pm1.chw.dowco.com  
X-Trace: 19 Feb 2000 15:30:52 -0800, dial-231.pm1.chw.dowco.com  
Lines: 206  
Path:  
newsmaster1.prod.itd.earthlink.net!nntp.earthlink.net!newsfeed1.earthlink.net!uwm.edu!log  
bridge.uoregon.edu!enews.sgi.com!news.idt.net!news.vphos.net!dial-  
231.pm1.chw.dowco.com  
Xref: nntp.earthlink.net alt.religion.scientology:1075404

-----  
On Fri, 18 Feb 2000 11:24:18 -0500, Stacy Brooks  
<stacybrooks@mciworld.com> wrote:

>On Thu, 17 Feb 2000 15:56:44 -0500, "Jeffrey Liss" <monupics@ispchannel.com>  
>wrote:

>

>>Still more questions which deserve an answer. Why won't you speak up?  
>>Why do you remain in this silent, defensive posture? I would have  
>>thought you would be eager to attack these questions with the verbal  
>>stilletto that is a well-reasoned argument.

>>

>>1. Scientology's official biographers claim that L. Ron Hubbard's  
>>flirtation with satanism and black magick was part of a U.S.  
>>government-sanctioned operation, in which Hubbard was ordered to  
>>infiltrate and "shut down" the group. Why, then, did Hubbard speak  
>>fondly of Alistaire Crowley later in life? Why have Scientology's  
>>various mouthpieces (e.g. Freedom Magazine) offered no documentary  
>>evidence to support the "intelligence service" story? Why has the  
>>church, which has used the Freedom of Information Act extensively in  
>>the past, not tracked down the documents to prove their claim? Why  
>>does Hubbard's FBI file (the FBI being the sole agency authorized to  
>>carry out domestic intelligence) contain no reference to the  
>>operation? And, lest conspiracy or coverup be alleged, why would the  
>>government conceal or destroy evidence of Hubbard's mundane mission  
>>but leave a paper trail of harassment operations against Martin Luther  
>>King, Jr.; radiation exposure of U.S. civilians, the "Tuskegee



>>Experiments," etc.?

>

>Hi Jeffrey,

>

>You won't get a response from OSA on this subject, because no documentation of

>Hubbard's "intelligence operation" explanation exists. I know this from

>firsthand experience.

>

>Back in 1981 my then-husband Vaughn Young was assigned to take over the LRH

>Archives after Gerry Armstrong blew. In early 1982 I was assigned to be his

>assistant. We knew that Gerry had been busted for voicing concerns about some

>of the unverifiable claims LRH had made about his life.

I hadn't been busted. I remained on post as LRH Archivist/Biography  
Researcher until I escaped on December 12, 1981.

> But we believed the

>party line about Gerry -- that he had been a shoddy researcher and had assumed

>LRH was lying simply because Gerry couldn't find the documents to prove LRH's

>story. Vaughn was known for his investigative reporting skills, but he also

>began to run into bewildering difficulty trying to track down documentation

>for many of Hubbard's claims about his life.

>

>At the time Vaughn and I were utterly mystified by this. As dedicated

>Scientologists, we never questioned LRH. If LRH said something had happened,

>that was that. It had happened. So why, for example, couldn't we find a copy

>of his nuclear physics degree? Why didn't his medical records from the Navy

>reflect that he had been crippled and blinded during World War II? Why

>couldn't we find any evidence that the ranch where he grew up "riding horses

>by the age of two" was a quarter the size of Montana? Why didn't the Blackfoot

>Indian tribe have any record of LRH having been a blood brother?

>

>A Scientologist is trained to "duplicate" what LRH says exactly -- no

>interpreting, no explaining, no "alter-ising," as they say. In the Sea Org,

>everyone has to "go to study" at least two and a half hours a day, and of

>course the main thing anyone ever studies is LRH writings and tapes. If you

>disagree with anything he says, or if you think something he says conflicts

>with something he has said elsewhere, it means you have a misunderstood word

>and therefore haven't duplicated the materials. If you get word clearing and

>still have a disagreement it means you have an out-ethics situation and you're

>sent to ethics for O/W writeups or conditions or sec-checking -- whatever is

>needed to clean you up so you can once again duplicate what LRH has said.

>

>So you can imagine our dilemma. Here we had in LRH's own handwriting dramatic

>stories about this wonderful man's epic life. Why couldn't we document them?



>Why, in fact, did the documents we were finding tell a totally different --  
>decidedly less dramatic and definitely not wonderful -- story?

>  
>By February 1982 Vaughn and I were both in Author Services, Inc. and being run  
>directly by David Miscavige and Terri Gamboa. As we continued to review all  
>the documents in the Archives we began to find irrefutable evidence that some  
>of the things LRH had said were false. And we began to find certain documents  
>that, if they ever were made public, would paint LRH as a vicious, petty  
>tyrant. Some were even worse than that. We suspected that Gerry Armstrong had  
>made copies of at least some of the Archives and that Omar Garrison, who had  
>been contracted to write LRH's biography, had those copies.

In fact, I was required by contract to provide documents from  
Hubbard's personal archive to Omar. The parties to the contract were  
Pubs DK and Omar. The contract was written, and its conditions  
specified, by Hubbard's personal attorney Alan Wertheimer (LA, Calif.)

>Now Gerry had  
>blown and there was no telling what he would do.

>  
>Vaughn finally screwed up his courage to report this situation to DM and  
>Terri. We both knew it was a touchy thing to bring up so Vaughn and I spent  
>days trying to figure out how to present this so as not to get in trouble for  
>it. Finally Vaughn went in and, as gently as possible, told DM and Terri that  
>some of the documents in the Archives could present serious PR problems if  
>they were ever made public. I was in the office across the hall and heard what  
>happened.

>  
>Actually, I couldn't hear what Vaughn said, but there was no way not to hear  
>what DM and Terri said. They were screaming. DM got furious at Vaughn for  
>questioning LRH's integrity. Didn't Vaughn realize that the documents in the  
>Archives that discredited LRH had been planted by the FBI? LRH had told him so  
>himself. How could Vaughn have doubted LRH? Obviously he had hidden crimes.

>  
>Vaughn was sec checked for days after that, and he never brought up the  
>subject again. But in 1984 DM ordered that a lawsuit be brought against Gerry  
>Armstrong for theft of documents because of the copies Gerry had made.

Actually the lawsuit was filed in August, 1982. Trial was April -  
June, 1984.

> Gerry  
>responded by providing a list of falsehoods he had discovered in LRH's  
>background to show that he was so frightened when he left that he felt he



>needed the documents to defend himself against the inevitable Black PR  
>campaign that would be launched against him.

Actually I didn't take any documents when I left. When DM had me declared an SP, when I knew Scientology intel operatives were spying on me and harassing my friends and family, when DM had some photos of mine stolen, and when I demanded the photos be returned and DM's junior Terri Gamboa (my ex-wife) refused and told me to get a lawyer, \*then\* I went to Omar and got from him copies of documents I thought I would need to defend myself. These were documents I'd earlier provided him pursuant to Scientology's contract.

Omar and I made copies of most of the documents I'd earlier provided him from Hubbard's archive because he feared that Scientology would steal back from him the documents he needed to write the biography. Omar, of course, had written Playing Dirty about Scientology's theft of documents from US government agencies, so his worry about Scientology stealing from him was well founded.

>

>To prepare for that trial Vaughn and a team of researchers, including me, were  
>assigned to document once and for all each of the points Gerry had listed as  
>>falsehoods. We all started off full of determination and self-righteous  
>indignation at Gerry's smearing LRH's name. But by the time we were finished,  
>all of us secretly knew that Gerry had been absolutely right. We weren't able  
>to document even ONE of the points Gerry had listed.

>

>We did everything possible to track down ANY trace of truth in LRH's story  
>that he had been on a mission for Naval intelligence to break up Crowley's  
>Black Magick ring. Instead, we found overwhelming evidence to show that in  
>fact, Hubbard participated heavily in the Black Magick rituals. We also  
>confirmed that Sara Northrup was living with Jack Parsons when Hubbard moved  
>into Parson's house in Pasadena, and that Hubbard began a relationship with  
>her while they were both participating in Black Magick rituals with Jack  
>Parsons. We also found extensive documentation that Hubbard defrauded Parsons  
>when he took off with Sara. We found irrefutable evidence that Hubbard had  
>married Sara while still married to his first wife, Polly, and we also found  
>that contrary to what Hubbard later said, he was the father of Alexis  
>Hollister, his child with Sara.

>

>It was a nightmare for all of us, because here we were under orders to  
>document that LRH had been a hero, and in instance after instance we were  
>finding instead that Hubbard had lived a life that ranged from mediocrity to  
>downright sordidness and criminality. We managed to escape dire consequences  
>by spinning tall tales about each of the points Gerry had listed, but our



>pathetic "DAs" didn't impress Judge Paul Breckinridge. I think everyone is  
>familiar with his famous ruling that Hubbard was a paranoid schizophrenic and  
>that the organization of Scientology reflects the psychosis of its founder.

>  
>After that project Vaughn and I both knew we were living on borrowed time. The  
>big bust came in 1987 when DM sent Vaughn to the RPF in the big Broeker purge.  
>The biography unit was disbanded, I was sent back to the Freedom office, and  
>no one else has ever been able to find any documentation beyond what we found  
>on that project for the Armstrong trial. By now I am sure that DM himself  
>knows about all of Hubbard's lies.

DM knew in 1981 that Hubbard had lied. During that year I critiqued several Hubbard biographies published by Scientology, listing lies in these publications. These "biographies" were "about the author" sections in books, "Executive Directives" and other mimeo issues, and PR and marketing handouts about Hubbard. All of them were written or approved by Hubbard himself. My critiques went to DM, who was above the Special Project and Mission All Clear.

DM and every person in his regime knows that Hubbard lied and that he is rightly declared to be a pathological liar. DM and all these people have made the conscious decision to ignore the lies and suppress their own consciences. None of them care a fig about "ethics" or Scientology, other than how these things can be used to accumulate more power and keep their support base ignorant and suppressed. They have all accepted that Hubbard was a pathological liar and have accepted that pathological lying is the road to total power.

> This is why no "official" biography of L.  
>Ron Hubbard has ever been published. I doubt one ever will.

Scientology paid Omar \*not\* to write the biography. The present \*official\* Hubbard biographer is Dan Sherman, an OSA intel operative Scientology used to "befriend" me and ultimately set me up in the "Armstrong Operation" illegal videotaping with cult PI Eugene M. Ingram. Sherman still works for the cult, and I believe is one of the more rotten anonymous attack posters Scientology has "handling" a.r.s.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>  
>Stacy  
>  
>





From: Gerry Armstrong <armstrong@dowco.com>  
Subject: Re: Rule 60 draft almost ready  
Date: 20 Mar 2000 00:00:00 GMT  
Message-ID: <kgqcds4r8ji8cto178fkak60vj3fbv9rui@4ax.com>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
References: <8b4ukt\$nbr\$1@slb7.atl.mindspring.net>  
X-Trace: 20 Mar 2000 10:56:23 -0800, tchl1c021.chw.dowco.com  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology

On 20 Mar 2000 10:30:53 GMT, Keith Henson  
<hkhenson@netcom3.netcom.com> wrote:

>I have a draft motion which is not quite up to the point I want to post  
>it. If any of the regulars who make editing suggestions to me want to  
>see a copy, drop me an email. Keith Henson

Keith, and others: Just some thoughts for your consideration.

The acts against Graham Berry aren't the only misconduct. specifically  
in your litigation, which give rise to a relief from judgment due to  
attorney misconduct or other related bases.

What was done with me alone in your case is a small part of the  
overall, staggering fraud upon the court, and obstruction of justice,  
by the \$cientology organizations, their leaders and attorneys. But a  
big enough part to get you the relief you want, or give you an  
opportunity to get it into other forums. I would imagine a denial of a  
motion for relief from judgment for the acceptable reasons is an  
appealable order.

You retained me as an expert witness for your trial, remitting to me  
\$150.00. That was my previous hourly fee as a retained expert on  
\$cientology, particularly its basic policy of fair game, in Hunziker  
v. Applied Materials. I have, as you know, many sliding scales.

Within a short time of receipt of your money against expert witness  
fees, I left the U.S. and went to Canada because of the frightening  
fraud I found out about in \$cientology's 1023 submission. You have  
sufficient IRS facts at your fingertips now, in addition to the 1023,  
to be able to link the \$cientology-IRS fraud upon the people, into the  
motion for relief from judgment.

\$cientology's same lawyers threatened me if I responded to Grady's  
subpoena before the same Judge, Whyte. I wrote a declaration,  
containing adequate proof of my knowledge and expert testimony, about  
the threat and sent it to the Judge, and served it on all parties.  
Everyone had legal notice.

Without service, and hence without a hearing, and while I'm B.C.,

000387



Scientology's same lawyers got a contempt order against me from the Marin judge, for sending the declaration to Judge Whyte advising him of the threat from Scientology. The Marin judge had issued illegal orders against me making "legal" Scientology's obstruction of justice, specifically obstructing my being able to assist people, such as yourself, who are targets of Scientology's basic policy of fair game, and most specifically, the kind of assistance you needed in your legal battle with Scientology.

Then Scientology got a warrant for my arrest, and then another contempt order, and another warrant for a bunch of my early internet complaints about the injustice, the abuse and the illegality of it all. Did they recently post a list of all my messages to a.r.s. for which I was ordered fined and jailed?

Your trial comes along, and your one \*retained\* expert is \*detained\* by actions, including illegal and immoral ones, by the adversary and its coconspiring attorneys. The subjects to which I would have testified are outlined in the declaration I sent Judge Whyte.

Judge Whyte was very fortunate in being able to skirt the issue of Scientology's unclean hands. And he was very fortunate to be able to bury in the three cases in front of him, my declaration and the clearcut evidence of Scientology's misconduct it presented. But his good fortune at others' misfortune should gracefully cease.

Because of what was done to you, and your attorney, and your single witness, among other Scientology misconduct I'm sure, you were prevented from adequate preparation before trial and were prevented from adequately defending yourself at trial. Thus Grady's case is similarly affected. Grady saw what happened to you without a witness. I was no less a witness for Grady, having written and served my expert declaration in response to his legal subpoena and Scientology's obstructive threat.

I think you can include in your motion mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect, and relate all those factors to the facts you know of Scientology misconduct.

You were probably excusably negligent, for example, in not recognizing until now that Scientology is way way worse and ten times as dangerous as you believed it to be when you exposed Scientology's bulletins calling for the illegal practice of medicine, and even at the time of your trial.

What is the date by which you must file a motion?

I really believe that Judge Whyte is crooked in some way. He should have found a way to bar Scientology from his courtroom very early in these cases. So should Judge Thomas have over in Marin. I think there is a streak of crookedness throughout the judiciary which can always find well spoken legal support for its crookedness. I mean that if



Judge Whyte favors the crooked at all he's crooked. It goes without saying, but it can be said legally, authoritatively and correctly that Scientology, the rough corporation which slouches into the nation's courtrooms, is crooked. Scientology's crookedness \*is\* on trial and always will be.

Because the "justice" system is peopled by people who reward and are rewarded by crookedness, I don't look to the legal arena much anymore for justice. Nevertheless, if there is any justice in the legal arena I think that you have the basis for having the judgment against you set aside, and I would help as I'm able. I am constantly reminded that God, being so wrapped up with justice, cannot be kept out of the legal arena, so as unjust and as silly as our justice system has become, why should I stay out myself.

What Scientology is doing in holding me "legally" unable to participate in the pursuit of justice and "legally" punishing any such participation is obstruction of justice. Don't forget that's what Mary Sue did time for.

Ken Dandar and his cool co-counsel probably could put together a dynamite motion to have Scientology release everyone from any contract by which they are prevented from providing voluntary testimony in the McPherson wrongful death case. (God, if there was ever a wrongful death, and there have been wrongful deaths from the beginning of history, it is Lisa McPherson's death.) The lawyers can get Scientology's obstruction in front of a judge for \$15.00, or whatever motions cost in Florida. (I know it takes many attorney hours beyond \$15.00, so it only works if it's seen as an opportunity.)

It's actually a good idea, come to think of it. Ford Greene knows Scientology's obstruction plan, with all the "Flynn agreements," with the Aznarans,' with Vaughn's and Stacy's "agreements," with Jesse's. I've got to laugh because Ford really has Scientology's number, and I'm in good part responsible. I think Ken has already had to address Scientology's gag "agreements" in connection with Jesse's working on the case.

If motions are still happening in the McPherson case, it could be a good one. I know that lawyers litigating against Scientology tend to get into responding only because Scientology deluges them with their own motion puffery, but this could be a newsworthy, narrow and simple motion. IANAL as you know, and much of this is "inspired," rather than researched.

Because it is within Scientology's power to release with a flick of a pen everyone the cult illegally prohibits from speaking or testifying voluntarily, a nice quick clean cheap demand letter could be sent. Scientology would of course have to refuse to release all the named and unnamed people in the demand letter. Thus setting the stage for a nice quick clean cheap motion.



Everyone who litigates against \$cientology starts out with key witnesses gagged. It isn't enough that the \$cientologists' own people have a basic policy of telling whatever lies they're told to tell. They also use the Wog (R) courts to gag wog (R) witnesses. The Florida Court clearly has the authority to order \$cientology to release everyone from any "contract" by which they would be prevented from testifying in this case. Florida is probably a great place to start

My deposition was taken in the McPherson case, so there's already available substantial testimony of my involvement as a knowledgeable, indeed, expert witness, to support a beefy motion to compel \$cientology to release me, and release everyone else like me. I'm a witness that \$cientology has driven to Canada, attacks without letup, and prevents by an illegal court order from testifying about wide experience and knowledge. And \$cientology is a subject and organization about which no one may legally be silenced. It would be cool if Lisa was the spark to burn down \$cientology's walls of \$ilence.

There's a memorable exchange between Ken and Sandy Weinberg at the start of my deposition on the subject of my being in violation of California court orders and Ken being in contempt. Weinberg, who was really quite a bully, asserts that I was found guilty of "criminal contempt," which isn't so. Weinberg's and \$cientology's threats to me and to Ken, even though I had been served with a deposition subpoena, are evidence of their determination to obstruct justice.

\$cientology threatened to go to the judge in the McPherson case to get my deposition testimony stricken or sealed, but I don't think they ever did. If my Florida friends would like, any and all of you sure have my permission to put it up on LMT's site. It's in Lisa's case, after all. I think she'd want everyone to hear it. I thought about this many months ago, but there wasn't a Lisa McPherson Trust back then. Way to go everyone.

Ken videotaped the depo, so everyone can see little old me sitting there for maybe four hours. It's embarrassing to think about, and even at this instant makes me chuckle, because Weinberg examines me on the standard set of embarrassing or obscene writings from the pig dream period that DM has his lawyers and his other agent scumsuckers tricked from me and now trot out every once in a while.

Weinberg also questions me about the Organization of United Renunciants (OUR) (R), and my letters to Saddam and other less despotic political folks during the Middle East Crisis. There is a set of exhibits which \$cientology brought to the deposition for me to authenticate which could be webbed and which would make a very nice set with the transcript and video.

The testimony and the attorney exchanges I think can be educational to anyone involved with \$cientology, wog (R) and \$cientologist alike. I remember more than anything I was asked or I said being very cold.



sitting all afternoon shivering in a cold draft. While Scientology thought I was being grilled. Brian Haney sat in on the depo, and I remember him being quietly supportive throughout while Weinberg tried to have his way with me.

There are some mentions of a.r.s and a.r.s. participants in the depo, so it might be fun to have it up for everyone. Legally for me, now would be an excellent time for the depo to be webbed, but any time is equally excellent. So if it is webbed it will not be because anyone is acting in concert with me to violate the illegal California injunction.

It's funny. My legal situation could be handled in any jurisdiction in the world. Nobody has to go anywhere because anyone in any jurisdiction is affected. Lisa McPherson can handle it for me.

Same could be done in the Wollersheim case. I was a witness as MCCS 2nd to the C&C gutting. My testimony is already being used in the alter ego issue. David Miscavige recently filed a perjured declaration about me in that case. And the lawyers don't contact me to rebut DM's lies because of the illegal order prohibiting me from even clearing my reputation in order to help Lawrence Wollersheim obtain justice.

Sooner or later some court is going to have to address the obstruction of justice issue and will have to rule that Scientology's obstruction of justice is legal or illegal. Because it really is obstruction, the charge can continue to be made in any jurisdiction, the same facts laid out, with more added.

Obstruction of justice cases and claims can be filed wherever any party with a claim resides or already has ongoing litigation. Because of Scientology's illegal silencing of knowledgeable witnesses, everyone who has ever had anything to do with Scientology has a legal claim. I'd bet that nobody else has cognized about this in just this way, so the statute of limitations for everyone's claim would run from the time they now have the cognition. Again IANAL.

It would be nice to have a litigation meeting sometime so that everyone up against the Scientology conspiracy in the legal arena can see what we all bring to the war.

Go ahead and send me the motion you've prepared.

I hope this is helpful.

P & M.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

000391



From: Gerry Armstrong <armstrong@dowco.com>  
Subject: Re: Picket opportunities: Flag World Tour schedule  
Date: 16 Apr 2000 00:00:00 GMT  
Message-ID: <ttjkfs8thevmkd8vlt85n7kjpj5frerr861@4ax.com>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
References: <38f6c3df.7594194@news1.tninet.se>  
X-Trace: 16 Apr 2000 16:43:50 -0800, dial-216.pm1.chw.dowco.com  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology

On Fri, 14 Apr 2000 07:34:33 GMT, catarina@pamnell.com (Catarina Pamnell) wrote:

>Some upcoming events from "Flag's OT Eternity Tour" (i.e. sales  
>meeting):

>

>April 22: Copenhagen, San Diego, Boston

>

>May 6: Stuttgart, Seattle, Puerto Rico

>

>June 3: Munich, Vancouver, Dallas

Okay, well, if I'm around, Sheila give me a call a couple of days  
before the OT Eternity Tour sales meeting in Vancouver to see if  
there's a No OTs Here Protest in the works.

>

>June 17: Zurich, Portland, Houston

Seattle is just a bus ride away. Maybe I can do Seattle \*and\*  
Vancouver. I'll bet June in Zurich is nice.

April 22 in Copenhagen, San Diego and Boston are fast approaching. Is  
this going to pull Bob Minton into a No OTs Here Protest in Boston?  
Guard his flanks.

>

>Come see real OT's in action! ;-)

What a total gift Catarina! Your intel sources are so good we have to  
caution against \$cientology perhaps concocting a sheepdipped  
itinerary. Has there been corroboration?

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

>

>

>

>Catarina

000392

128





From: Gerry Armstrong <armstrong@dowco.com>  
Subject: Re: Pardon a new voice... but..  
Date: 04 May 2000 00:00:00 GMT  
Message-ID: <kka3hs876agune2h8c0m9lrkj8da4q8mja@4ax.com>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
References: <3911A292.E2431081@go.away>  
X-Trace: 4 May 2000 10:28:34 -0800, tchlcl69.chw.dowco.com  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology

On Thu, 04 May 2000 16:17:46 GMT, Noah Body <nonyabidness@go.away>  
wrote:

>I've just recently been informed of stuff like [//OT].net and the other  
>related anti-sci webpages. I have to say, it has made for incredibly  
>fascinating reading.

>  
>At times, I have to wonder if this information is made up, seeing as how  
>utterly fantastic it seems. That was until yesterday, when I recieved  
>an account from someone I know who actually spent time on a compound.  
>It was a rather chilling story.

>  
>ANYHOW... that's not the point of this message. In my studies of the  
>cult, I've come across a lot of jargon. Most of it is fairly  
straightforward (spend some time in the military and you become used to  
acronyms and whatnot) but there are a few things that have eluded me.  
>Namely, what is a Sea org? Is it an org on a boat? Is it an  
>enforcement agency inside the church? I've tried to find some data  
>about it on the sites, but I dunno, it seemed kinda unclear.

The \$ea Org is a pseudonavy arm of \$cientology through which David  
Miscavige, the supreme dictator of the global \$cientology enterprise,  
and his cohorts, run all \$cientology organizations, franchises, front  
groups, lawyers and agents internationally.

\$ea Org members sign contracts for one billion years of "service."  
They all have naval grades or ranks; e.g., swamper, able bodied  
seaman, petty officer, ensign, captain, etc. Much more important than  
the \$O member's rank is his (or her) org post. Thus a petty officer in  
charge, for example, of covert intelligence ops in Europe, might have  
juniors who are midshipmen or lieutenants.

The \$O originated when \$cientology founder L. Ron Hubbard took to sea  
in or around 1967 because of public relations and legal problems his  
lying and abusive practices were causing in countries where  
\$cientology operated. Most of the \$ea Org personnel are now in land  
based orgs, although the \$O does operate a ship, the Freewinds, based  
in the Netherlands Antilles.

ubbard ran all of \$cientology for several years from on board \$O

000393



ships, using \$O personnel. In the \$O, Hubbard was the Commodore. His wife, Mary Sue Hubbard was the Deputy Commodore. To non-\$O \$cientologists, Hubbard was the Founder, and Mary Sue the Controller.

As Controller, and under Hubbard, Mary Sue ran the notorious Guardian's Office. The GO, which then contained \$cientology's espionage apparatus, consisted of all non-\$O personnel. In the early 80's the espionage apparatus, as well as the former GO litigation machinery and public relations bureaus, were renamed the Office of \$pecial Affairs. O\$A personnel are now all \$ea Org members, except for some agents, which are outside professionals or operated non-\$O \$cientologists.

\$cientology calls the \$ea Org a fraternal religious order, but it's actually anti-religious, more akin to the SS than any actual religious order one normally thinks of. The \$O operates its own penal system or gulags it calls the Rehabilitation Project Force. The \$O calls itself the most ethical group in the world, and states that its mission is to "get in ethics on the planet," but The \$O is actually an extremely unethical group, run by extremely unethical leaders, engaged in terrible antisocial activities and abuses.

\$O personnel are responsible for the death of Lisa McPherson, whom they locked up and mistreated for 17 days in their Flag Land Base in Clearwater, Florida. The \$O routinely locks up and mistreats people. They're able to get away with shocking psychological and physical abuse of people because of their group assertion that it is their religious right to abuse people.

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

>I understand that this message is probably little more than a  
>distraction, but even a quick \*ahem\* rundown of what it is would be very  
>appreciated.

>

>Thank ye.





From: Gerry Armstrong <armstrong@dowco.com>  
Subject: Re: Delighting Diane with religious freedom (was Educating PTSC)  
Date: 10 Jul 2000 00:00:00 GMT  
Message-ID: <ep7kmsc7gussnc5a5uobnul76rtbm81gca@4ax.com>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
References: <3965BC79@MailAndNews.com> <8k26h606fu@enews1.newsguy.com>  
<3964CD94.E78A2101@is.in-berlin.de> <3964f733.27490517@enews.newsguy.com>  
<39658C1A.3A3E7C15@is.in-berlin.de> <3965ba84.3953850@enews.newsguy.com>  
<3965FE5A.D01C903@is.in-berlin.de>  
<ji8cmssaph9jefg99ed8ogikkrltnggkb7@4ax.com>  
<39664653.27307354@enews.newsguy.com>  
<fnrhmskf3a468jeu7jl58mftpj6q7n6732@4ax.com>  
<39693f3e.6533413@enews.newsguy.com>  
<o0ia5.10508\$PU5.68316@news1.southeast.rr.com>  
X-Trace: 10 Jul 2000 12:17:24 -0700, tchl024.chw.dowco.com  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology

On Mon, 10 Jul 2000 11:52:52 GMT, "Rebecca Hartong"  
<praetorian@cox.rr.com> wrote:

>  
>"Diane Richardson" <referen@bway.net> wrote in message  
>news:39693f3e.6533413@enews.newsguy.com...  
> On Sun, 09 Jul 2000 14:30:34 -0700, Gerry Armstrong  
> <armstrong@dowco.com> wrote:  
>  
>> >Freedom for everyone to speak about his experiences,knowledge and  
>> >thoughts in any organization, church or cult, be it religious or not;  
>>  
>> No.  
>  
>I would have said: No, as long as the individual member hasn't signed a  
>legal non-disclosure agreement of some kind

Well, that's the question. Is a gag "contract" which prohibits someone  
from communicating about his "religious" experiences legal? If it's  
legal in the U\$ but not legal in, e.g., Germany, then Germany has  
greater freedom of religion than the U\$, wouldn't you agree?

Aren't you saying that because the U\$ permits "religions" to enslave  
people by "contract," the U\$ has more freedom than Germany where  
churches are not permitted to enslave people?

Because we're not free to enslave people by "contract" in Canada,  
we're not as free as in the U\$ where the freedom to enslave is legal?

But think about it, Rebecca. Do you honestly believe, even in the U\$,  
that a "contract" which prohibited someone from saying the word "God"  
or mentioning "Jesus Christ" is in any circumstance legal?

000395





From: Gerry Armstrong <armstrong@dowco.com>  
Subject: Scientology, the one true suppressive group (was A TRUE EXAMPLE OF INSANITY of THOUGHT)  
Date: 11 Jul 2000 00:00:00 GMT  
Message-ID: <754nms0qss9j47894h9ln23aud7ud4dp1r@4ax.com>  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
References: <84okms4f861nm9g54s6l0ta4ldukq9a4o9@4ax.com>  
<20000711023152.01273.00001585@ng-cv1.aol.com>  
X-Trace: 11 Jul 2000 14:27:45 -0700, tch1c059.chw.dowco.com  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Newsgroups: alt.religion.scientology

On 11 Jul 2000 06:31:52 GMT, mistmagoo55@aol.com (Mistmagoo55) wrote:

>>Subject: Re: A TRUE EXAMPLE OF INSANITY of THOUGHT  
>>From: Gerry Armstrong armstrong@dowco.com  
>>Date: 7/10/00 4:51 PM Pacific Daylight Time  
>>Message-id: <84okms4f861nm9g54s6l0ta4ldukq9a4o9@4ax.com>  
>>  
>>On 10 Jul 2000 23:17:43 GMT, mistmagoo55@aol.com (Mistmagoo55) wrote:  
>>  
>>>Subject: Death row is filled with OTs  
>>>From: Gerry Armstrong armstrong@dowco.com  
>>>Date: 7/9/00 8:16 PM Pacific Daylight Time  
>>>Message-id: <fofims4ecs9be01d6arf02mvklt7sqkrg@4ax.com>  
>>>  
>>>According to Russell Shaw, member of the criminal cult of Scientology,  
>>>an OT is someone who intended to do something and then did it. To the  
>>>degree that someone carried out what he intended he is OT.  
>>>  
>>>People are on death row because they are convicted of first degree  
>>>murder. They deliberately, intentionally killed someone. They intended  
>>>to kill another person and they did it.  
>>>  
>>>People who accidentally kill someone don't make it to death row.  
>>>They're just guilty of, for example, negligent homicide. But the first  
>>>degree murderers; those are the real OTs. Right Russell?  
>>>  
>>>(c) Gerry Armstrong  
>>>  
>>>We would say "So sorry you missed it" Gerry...but we know you didn't. We

000396



>>would  
>>>even explain it to others...but it is so obviously just truly insain, that  
>>no  
>>>explanation is needed. Just another feeble attempt, eh? Well, thank you  
>>for  
>>>showing the world what truly insane thinking looks like. Great example!  
>>  
>>You're welcome. I thought it was insane when Russell first provided  
>>this definition for OT, but then it hit me, as I see it has hit you  
>>that his thinking, or Hubbard's thinking really, is, as you say, truly  
>>insane.  
>

>Poof!

Now what does that make you, Magoon?

>Try to pawn your own insanity off on LRH eh?

Not at all. He had more than enough insanity. He had so much insanity  
he shares it even today with you 8 million clams?

> Not so fast, hot shot. You  
>are talkin with Magoo now.

Well, not really. I'm talking with the nanotyrant himself. You're just  
a funnel.

>>>  
>>>Hopefully you have someone helping you.  
>>  
>>I do indeed. I am not alone in this fight against the suppression of  
>>the Scientology cult. There are thousands of people who now have  
>>Scientology's number.  
>  
> Right...like the "thousands" who are posting here?

Probably even a considerable number of the thousands who post here,  
yes. But my help comes from way beyond a.r.s. We are legion.

>Give it a rest, Armstring.

Not until you suppressives quit suppressing people. That's out of my hands. All I can do is gently oppose your suppression.

Scientists will soon cognite that DM is a suppressive person. The leaders of the Scientology are suppressives. No one but no one here is suppressing people's communications but Scientists. You folks are the suppressives. Hubbard was a huge suppressive. In fact it can accurately be stated that cogniting that Hubbard is the suppressive on Scientists' cases is the way out of the suppression.

But why do you want to suppress people, Magoon?

>You know that is not true.

What, that Hubbard, DM and Scientology's other tyrants are suppressives? Of course they are. Anyone can see it. Who but a suppressive would seek to have someone jailed for speaking about his religious beliefs? Exactly how much more suppressive can you get. Of course it's true. You are a suppressive person, dominated and in the valence of the huge suppressives Hubbard and his suppressive replacement David Miscavige.

>>

>>>

>>>Magoo!

>>

>>So, Magoon, glad we're in comm. Have you read Hubbard's "Admissions?"

>>I posted them specifically for Scientists just like you. Humbly

>>tendered as a gift to clams.

>>

>>(c) Gerry Armstrong

>>

>Armstring! Ditto.

Oh, do you tender your gifts to clams humbly as well? I wouldn't think so. You're a suppressive person. You can't be humble. Or tender.

> Tell us about something way more interesting.....what's the

>deal with your Bench Warrent? Fill us in.

There are \*two\* warrants, oh suppressive clam boy. I revel in them. I celebrate them. For the pain they cause me, just consider the anguish



it causes the suppressives who run Scientology.

It is your cult masters who are stuck with the warrants. They showed how OT they are. They intended to suppress my communications and they did what they intended. They intended to have me enjoined from communicating my religious beliefs and they succeeded. They intended to have a court order me jailed for communicating my religious beliefs and the court did what they asked. Now the OTs are stuck with the result. OTs are suppressive. Scientologists are suppressive. Wow, what a cool, suppressive "religion."

(c) Gerry Armstrong

>

>Magoo!

